00020592

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

MEMORIALS

OF

BISHOP HAMPDEN

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

Painted by Daniel Macnee, R.S.A. *Engraved by William Holl.*

R. D. HAMILTON,

A.D. 1867.

SOME MEMORIALS

OF

RENN DICKSON HAMPDEN

BISHOP OF HEREFORD

EDITED BY HIS DAUGHTER

HENRIETTA HAMPDEN

VESTIGIA NULLA RETRORSUM

20592
a

LONDON
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
1871

00020592

INTRODUCTION.

THE FOLLOWING PAGES are little more than a compilation, and consist of the recollections of friends who knew Bishop Hampden long and well; of some of his letters; and of a small number of letters written to him, and bearing directly on his character or his works. Amongst the last-mentioned, there is a letter from Dr. Arnold, containing some interesting remarks on the pamphlet written by Dr. Hampden in 1834, in which he advocated the admission of Dissenters to the Universities, for the purpose of education; and also an extract from another letter by the same writer, on Dr. Hampden's appointment to the Regius Professorship of Divinity. These are now published by the kind permission of Mr. Matthew Arnold.

A letter written in November 1856, by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, will be found in Chapter XVIII. For the permission to insert this letter, so cordially and courteously granted by Mr. Gladstone, the Editor wishes to thank him here. The request was made with considerable hesitation, from the feeling that it would scarcely have had the Bishop's sanction, simply on account of his great reluctance ever to put himself personally forward. Still, it is certain that the letter gave him great

pleasure, and that he warmly appreciated the high and generous feeling it expresses.

This Volume further contains some general account of the opposition to his appointment, first as Regius Professor of Divinity, and afterwards as Bishop of Hereford. Doubtless, many causes—political and personal—combined on those occasions to swell the numbers, and to impart heat and bitterness to the struggle. Still, it seems to have been his advocacy of the claims of Dissenters to admission to the University of Oxford that drew down upon him so large a share of unpopularity; and the 'Bampton Lectures' (the ostensible cause, though published years before) were then reviewed with the acrimonious feelings which the views advocated in the pamphlet had excited in the minds of those who most strenuously opposed any less exclusive form of admission to the Universities than the one then existing—that which required subscription to the Articles of the Church of England.

The subject of his Bampton Lectures—'The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its relation to Christian Theology'—was, in his view, 'one of the most serious interest to all, who have a just concern for the maintenance of sound practical Christianity. We are tracing to its origin,' he says, 'that speculative logical Christianity, which survives among us at this day; and which has been in all ages the principal obstacle, as I conceive, to the union and peace of the Church of Christ.'* That the line of inquiry which he pursued in these Lectures was new—that he naturally, in

* Lecture II. (third edition), p. 53.

the University, addressed himself to 'a learned audience'—probably made the work difficult of comprehension to the general reader; and when prejudice and party feeling were brought to the study of it, instead of the patient investigation of the scholar, this difficulty would naturally be increased tenfold. In a letter from Lord Melbourne to the Professor, he says: 'I see Hallam, in his new publication (1837), says that you are the first Englishman who has ever known anything about Scholastic Theology. People who will tread into new and untrodden ground cannot expect to do so with impunity, as you have found.'

The endeavour is also made to give a slight sketch of Dr. Hampden as Rector of Ewelme, the living attached to the Divinity Professorship; and lastly, to portray some features of his work as Bishop of Hereford. In this responsible position he exerted all his powers to draw forth the energies and abilities of his clergy, not in sensational meetings and polemical discussions, but in the perfecting of the work especially committed to their care in their several cures—earnestly exhorting them to fit themselves for their great charge by religious and moral discipline, and by patient study. His attention was especially directed to the great subject of the education of the poor. In this respect the state of the diocese of Hereford was by no means satisfactory. He planned and established a Diocesan Board of Education, which gave an impulse to the cause throughout the diocese. His own exertions were never spared in any branch of his episcopal duties, but the manner in which they were performed was in keeping with his character—earnestly, thoroughly,

and unostentatiously—as by one who is anxious rather for the solid foundation of his building than for its decoration.

There is one remark that should be added to these introductory observations: it is, that in the midst of the many sounds of strife and contention that were heard in connection with his name, greatly as he deplored them for the sake of the Church and the country, his only part in them was the pain they could not fail to occasion him. In no one instance was he known to be influenced by any feeling of resentment or ill-will towards those who opposed him. On the contrary, firm in his own views, from the consciousness of their being formed after mature deliberation, he was ever ready to make excuse for judgments hastily and ignorantly formed.

The hand that writes these pages brings nothing to the work but the affection of years passed in close companionship with one whose rare simplicity of character made him, even in their early years, the equal, friend, and companion of his children, with whom he has left the firm conviction that the innermost thoughts of his heart were as those of a little child, in purity, in reverence, and in sweet humility.

H. H.

107 EATON PLACE, LONDON:
January 5, 1871.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

1793–1816.

PAGE

Birth and early education—College life—Contemporaries at Oriel—Successes—Fellowship at Oriel—Visits to Bath—Personal characteristics—Sketches by Bishop Hinds and Robert Ingham, Esq. Q.C. . 1

CHAPTER II.

1816–1832.

Ordination—Marriage—Curacies—Removes to London—Essay on the 'Philosophical Evidence of Christianity'—Letters from Bishop Copleston and Mr. Davison—'Parochial Sermons'—Returns to Oxford—Contribution to 'Encyclopædia Britannica'—Family trials—Appointed Bampton Lecturer (1832)—Work at Oxford—Mr. Blanco White 15

CHAPTER III.

1832–1833.

The 'Bampton Lectures'—Letters of the Bishop of Kildare and Archdeacon Hare—Appointed Principal of St. Mary Hall—Recollections of Dr. Hampden by the Rev. William Sinclair—Dr. Hampden at St. Mary Hall—State of the College—Improvements effected . 24

CHAPTER IV.

1833–1835.

Question of 'Tests' at Oxford—Dr. Hampden's 'Observations on Dissent'—Letter from Dr. Arnold—Dr. Hampden to Archbishop Whately—Appointed Professor of Moral Philosophy (1834)—'Moral Philosophy Lectures'—Proposed offer of a Bishopric (1835)—University Tests—Letter to Mr. Nassau Senior 35

CHAPTER V.

1836.

PAGE

Regius Professorship of Divinity offered by Lord Melbourne—Commotion at Oxford—Remarks of Archbishop Whately—His account of the proceedings—Letter from Dr. Hampden to Archbishop Whately—To the Archbishop of Canterbury—Letter of Bishop Copleston—Dr. Hampden's attitude—Letters from Lord Melbourne—Further letter from Dr. Hampden to Archbishop Whately . . 49

CHAPTER VI.

Inaugural Lecture as Regius Professor of Divinity—Description in 'Edinburgh Review,' by Dr. Arnold—Letter from the same—Letter from Dr. Hampden to Editor of 'Edinburgh Review'—Attempt to exclude Dr. Hampden from the election of Select Preachers—Account of the proceedings, by Mr. Nassau Senior—Letter of the Rev. E. Rowlandson—Letter from Dr. Hampden to Archbishop Whately 60

CHAPTER VII.

Dr. Hampden at the outbreak of the agitation on his appointment as Regius Professor—His comments on the treatment of his writings—Letter to Bishop Phillpotts—Attitude towards his opponents—'Select Preachers' statute passed—Mr. W. W. Hull's pamphlet—Dr. Arnold's feeling in the matter—Letter from the Duke of Sussex—Conversation with an Unitarian 71

CHAPTER VIII.

The 'Dublin Review' on the agitation—Second edition of 'Bampton Lectures'—'Introduction' prefixed—Dr. Hampden's entry on his work as Regius Professor—Results—Letter to Mr. W. W. Hull—To Archbishop Whately—Attitude as regards the Tract Party—Dr. Arnold's view of Dr. Hampden's position—Correspondence with the Duke of Wellington (1837) 83

CHAPTER IX.

Discussion in the House of Lords on Dr. Hampden's case (December 1837)—Lord Radnor—Duke of Wellington—Lord Brougham—Lord Winchilsea—Archbishop of Canterbury—Lord Radnor in reply—Letter from Dr. Hampden to the Archbishop of Canterbury. 93

CHAPTER X.

University Reform—Letters to Mr. W. W. Hull—Cathedral stalls—Proposal to repeal the 'Select Preachers' statute—The proposal

PAGE

rejected—Question raised by Mr. Macmullen—Mr. Ward's case—Letters to Mr. W. W. Hull—The Grant to Maynooth—Letter to Mr. W. W. Hull—Representation of the University—Dr. Hampden's 'University Sermons' 112

CHAPTER XI.

Life at Ewelme—Intercourse with Parishioners—Dissent—Ewelme Church—Recreations—Letter to his eldest son—Letters to the Rev. W. Hayward Cox—Anniversary of the Battle of Chalgrove Field—Departure from Ewelme—Address from Parishioners, and reply . 124

CHAPTER XII.

1847.

Appointed Bishop of Hereford—Opposition to the appointment—Its character—Archdeacon Hare's 'Letter to the Dean of Chichester'—Letter from Dean Cramer on the proceedings in 1836—Protest by thirteen Bishops—Lord John Russell's reply—Proposal to institute a suit against Dr. Hampden—Correspondence—Addresses of sympathy 138

CHAPTER XIII.

1847-1848.

Election to the Bishopric by the Chapter of Hereford—'Confirmation' of the Election—Opposition by three Clergymen—Application to the Court of Queen's Bench—Application refused—Judgments of Mr. Justice Erle and the Chief Justice 154

CHAPTER XIV.

Letters to Mr. W. W. Hull and Bishop Copleston—Consecration as Bishop of Hereford—Sermon by Dr. Hinds—Entry on Episcopal work—Votes for the Jewish Disabilities Bill—Third edition of 'Bampton Lectures' 161

CHAPTER XV.

Confirmations in 1848—A Confirmation Sermon—Letter to Miss Biddulph on a case of late Baptism—Ordinations—Case of Literates—Letters dimissory—Sundry letters—The 'Nemesis of Faith' . . 170

CHAPTER XVI.

1849-1850.

Early educational efforts in the diocese of Hereford—Speech on Education in country districts — Characteristics as a speaker — Remarks on Education in first Charge 178

CHAPTER XVII.

1850.

PAGE

Re-opening of Hereford Cathedral for Divine Service—Restoration — Bishop Hampden's views as to Choral Services—Services at St. Barnabas, Pimlico—Death of his eldest daughter — Oxford University Commission—The Gorham Case—Visit to the Isle of Wight—The 'Papal Aggression' 187

CHAPTER XVIII.

Objects aimed at in Bishop Hampden's Charges and Addresses—Views as to revival of Convocation—Character of the teaching in his Charges and Sermons—Letter from the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone 194

CHAPTER XIX.

Christmas, 1861—The Prince Consort's death—Sermon in Hereford Cathedral—Bishop Hampden in the pulpit—His distribution of patronage—Influence on Clergy of diocese—Remarks by Archdeacon Waring—New churches—Construction of churches—The Baptismal Service—Regard for children—Letter to a child . . 201

CHAPTER XX.

1862.

Extract from unpublished Charge—'Mythical Interpretation of the Facts of the Gospel' 210

CHAPTER XXI.

1863.

Letter from Paris—Occupations in London—Disrelish for general society—New edition of articles on Ancient Philosophy—Note from Sir G. C. Lewis—Facility in mastering books—General reading—Delight in natural scenery—Sir G. C. Lewis—Memorial to him erected in Hereford—Lord Palmerston at the Unveiling . 222

CHAPTER XXII.

1863.

Diocesan duties—Spirit in which undertaken—Views as to Church and State agitation—Justification of attitude towards Dissenters—'Colenso on the Pentateuch'—Letter addressed to the clergy of his diocese—Its usefulness 228

CHAPTER XXIII.

1865-1868.

PAGE

Death of Mrs. Hampden (1865)—Letter to his sister, Mrs. King—Importance attached to Confirmation—Case of candidates from St. Martin's Home—Serious illness of Dr. Hampden in 1866—Assistance rendered by Bishops of Peterborough and Worcester—His last Ordination (1867)—Hereford Musical Festival in 1867—Continued illness—Closing days—Death 233

CHAPTER XXIV.

General Recollections 243

APPENDIX A.

Personal Recollections of Bishop Hampden, by the Venerable Archdeacon Clark, formerly one of his Chaplains 249

APPENDIX B.

I. Dr. Hampden's letter to the Duke of Wellington on the proceedings of 1836—II. The Duke of Wellington's reply—III. Letter from Dr. Hampden to Lord John Russell (1847)—IV. Letter from Lord John Russell to the Dean of Hereford (1847)—V. Reply of Lord John Russell to an Address from the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Bedford—VI. The Bishop of Norwich's (Dr. Stanley) Reasons for Not Joining in the Protest of the Bishops 261

List of the Published Works of Bishop Hampden 280

INDEX 281

MEMORIALS

OF

R. D. HAMPDEN,

BISHOP OF HEREFORD.

CHAPTER I.

1793-1816.

BIRTH AND EARLY EDUCATION — COLLEGE LIFE — CONTEMPORARIES AT ORIEL—SUCCESSES — FELLOWSHIP AT ORIEL—VISITS TO BATH — PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS — SKETCHES BY BISHOP HINDS AND ROBERT INGHAM, ESQ. Q.C.

RENN DICKSON HAMPDEN was born in the Island of Barbadoes on March 29, 1793, that day being Good Friday—a fact he often commented on. He was the eldest son of Renn Hampden and Frances Raven his wife, and was descended from a junior branch of the same stock as the patriot John Hampden.* The family had been long resident in the West Indies, having left England at the time of the Restoration of Charles II. The same, it is said, was the case with many families whose names had been too prominent on the Parliamentary side for them to expect advancement at home at that time.

He sailed from Barbadoes on May 8, 1798, being then

* He remembered from his earliest years that it was a traditionary counsel in the family that no member of it should do anything to disgrace Hampden's great name.

five years of age, with his godmother M. A. Dickson and his two sisters. They arrived in England on June 30; and very shortly after he was placed under the care of the Rev. M. Rowlandson, vicar of Warminster, Wilts, where he remained until 1811, when he entered as a Commoner at Oriel College, Oxford.

He was remarkable in his early childhood for the readiness with which he acquired information. His child-intelligence went forth to meet knowledge in any form and for its own sake, for he never talked or boasted of his studies. In later years, when questioned by his children, he would tell of his favourite childish pursuits, of his interest in field flowers that he used to gather and bring home, that he might find out about them in an old book on botany he discovered lying about somewhere; and how, after a while, he got a small tin case in which he brought home the flowers in a better state of preservation, so that he could find out much more about them. He also owned to the boyish mischief of helping to put some cobbler's-wax on the saddle of the French master, who used to ride from some distance to give lessons in French to Mr. Rowlandson's pupils, and whose seat on horseback was a subject of remark to his unruly pupils, who watched at some distance the result of their thoughtless mischief. For this, he always said, he was very sorry, for the master taught them well, and was kind.

A letter from his sister Mary, who was eleven years his senior, dated June 3, 1802, when he was nine years old, shows how the absent boy was regarded in his home. It is written from Barbadoes. She says:—

My dearest Brother,—Having just been informed that there is a vessel to sail for England to-day, I avail myself of the opportunity to write to you, though I have not, as I expected, had a letter from you since my arrival. But I readily excuse you, as your kind friends Mr. and Mrs. Rowlandson assure us that you are a dear, good little boy, and very attentive to

your studies. I know you can have little time to spare from your books and recreations; still, I hope you will write to me sometimes, for it is my most earnest wish to keep up a correspondence with a brother for whom I have the greatest affection, and who will hereafter, I trust, prove a comfort to his family, and an honour to those who have had the care of his education. Indeed, my dear Renn, I consider you truly fortunate in being situated as you are, and flatter myself you will continue to deserve the parental tenderness you experience from your friends at the Vicarage. Your picture hangs in the drawing-room, just over our piano, and I never sit to it without wishing the original with us.

Adieu, my dearest brother. Your very affectionate sister,

MARY HAMPDEN.

P.S. I had almost forgotten to tell you that our little noisy brother John* sends his love to you. He just begins to sit at

* Mr. John Hampden married Mary Georgina, sister of the late Sir Edmund Filmer, Bart. He died at Leamington in 1860. He was a member of University College, Oxford, a man of considerable natural ability and great taste in Art, and well-known as an antiquarian. His brother wrote the following inscription for his tomb:—

IN SEPULCHRO SUB HAC ÆDE SACRATA
RELIQUIÆ JACENT MORTALES

JOHANNIS HAMPDEN, ARM^{I}.

AB ANTIQUA STIRPE CUJUS NOMEN GEREBAT ORIUNDI
NAT. OCTOB^{S}. XXVII^{O}. MDCCXCVIII. MORT. NOV^{S}. XIII^{O}. MDCCCLX.
OPTIMO INGENIO PRÆDITUS
LITERARUM QUIBUS A PUERO IMBUTUS ERAT STUDIOSUS
MORIBUS INTEGERRIMIS
PIO IN COGNATOS AMORE BENEVOLENTIA ERGA OMNES
EGREGIE COMMENDATUS.
MULTOS PER ANNOS PRIVATAM HIC EGIT VITAM
DONEC TANDEM DOMESTICO LUCTU
ET INGRAVESCENTE MORBO CONFECTUS
SPIRITUM DEO REDDIDIT
AFFLICTUS SED NON DESTITUTUS
UTPOTE QUI DIVINA GRATIA SIBI PERSUASUM HABERET
FILIOS DEI PER CHRISTUM
DOLORUM PATIENTIA CHRISTI SIMILES FIERI OPORTERE
DIEM ILLUM EXPECTANTES
QUANDO OMNEM LACRYMAM AB OCULIS EORUM
ABSTERGET DEUS
ET MORS, ET DOLOR, ET LUCTUS ULTRA NON ERUNT.

table when we have no company; and he charged me to send his love to Brother, and tell him he was a 'good boy,' which, however, he is not always.

In no circumstance of his life was he more fortunate than in being placed thus early under the care of Mr. Rowlandson. It is true that the training of a public school would have been an especial advantage to him, as tending to counteract the natural sensitive shyness of his disposition; but, on the other hand—the goodness, the sympathy, the refinement of Mr. Rowlandson's character harmonising so well with the character of his pupil—praise from him had its value, and afforded encouragement that would have been wanting in some degree in a public school. In his early school days, a certain Latin theme was highly commended by Mr. Rowlandson as being not only free from faults of composition, but as showing unusual scholarship in so childish a student. In later days he related, laughing at himself as he said it, that his delight at this praise was such that he went into the fields alone and there read the theme aloud to hear how it sounded.

In the year 1811 he entered as a Commoner at Oriel College, Oxford. Dr. Eveleigh was then Provost, and Copleston (afterwards Bishop of Llandaff) tutor;—as also was Mr. Davison, under whose immediate supervision, as college tutor, Hampden was placed. The mutual respect and esteem that began in this relation lasted through the lives of both; and had Mr. Davison been the survivor, he would have lamented over his pupil as sincerely as he was himself regretted when called to his rest after a pure and holy life—early, as it seemed to those who loved and honoured him. A letter written by him to Mr. Rowlandson records his first impressions of Renn Hampden. It is equally characteristic of the one written of and of the writer:—

The Rev. J. Davison to the Rev. M. Rowlandson.

Pilton House, Barnstaple: Aug. 9, 1811.

Dear Sir,—I have delayed writing to you till the time when I suppose you will have returned to Warminster, on a subject in which I know you take a very warm concern; and it gives me pleasure to think that I can do it in a manner which must be satisfactory to you. Ever since Mr. Hampden has been resident in Oriel, his conduct has been such (so far as it has come under my observation) as to mark a most estimable character, and recommend him to the good opinion of his College. You know his abilities are good; and I have no doubt, from the first exertion of them which I have seen, that he will pass through the University with some literary distinction. If there be anything which I could mention as a defect in him, it is a certain degree of modesty and diffidence which rather impairs his own pleasure in the intercourse he has with myself and some others of the senior members of the society. But every shade of modest feeling is so highly to be respected, that I must not be thought to point out this circumstance in his character as a real fault, but only as a thing which I regret, because it seems to take from his own ease and cheerfulness, and I know no person whose merits entitle him to enjoy them more than Mr. Hampden.

I am, dear sir, your faithful, humble servant,

J. Davison.

The intellectual superiority of Oriel at this time seems beyond all dispute; and as far as the world's judgment of the leading men of that society goes, the precedence was justly won. And good testimony is borne to the cause of education and cultivation by the lives of those men. Copleston, Davison, Whately, and Arnold, Hampden, and Hawkins: familiar as these names are as men of intellectual greatness, they are still better known for their strong religious convictions, the force of their characters, and the purity of their lives. They were not men who strove for the influence of personal popularity, but for God's truth, however they might be reviled for so doing.

A successful College life at Oriel must have been a

pleasant life. Hampden always spoke with eager pleasure of 'old Oriel days.' His ready ability made the acquirement of knowledge easy to him, and he loved it. His only recreation seems to have been music, in which he always delighted. He was joined in this by the late Lord Clinton, then Mr. Trefusis, and the late Mr. Packe, formerly M.P. for Leicestershire.

He had no private tutor or 'coach,' but read alone or in company with friends of the same standing. The last vacation before the examination for his B.A. degree, he read at Shanklin, and he always remembered the good wish for his success expressed by the landlady of Rose Cottage, where he lodged, that he might 'come off with *eclaw*' (éclat).

At the examination in Michaelmas Term 1813 he gained a 'double first,' which was made the more notorious by his name being the only one in the class-list that appeared among the firsts in both Classics and Mathematics. The examiners were J. C. Jones, J. Davison, T. Collins, and C. Lloyd (afterwards Bishop of Oxford); Dr. Lloyd being his *vivâ voce* examiner. Soon after the examination, he wrote for the Latin Essay. He gained the prize; but before the decision, he had left England for Barbadoes on a visit to his parents. A letter from Mr. Rowlandson to Hampden's father gives an account of his former pupil's success, and of the warm interest he took in it:—

The Rev. M. Rowlandson to Mr. Renn Hampden.

Warminster: June 14, 1814.

My dear Sir,—Having received a line from Renn, kindly informing us of their safe arrival off Madeira, and thus, so far, being relieved of our anxiety for the safety of your sons, we have no doubt that ere this the happy hour has arrived which affords to parents and children, after so long an absence from each other, a joy and happiness which none but themselves can well understand; and allow me to add, the circumstances under which you would have the happiness to meet would exalt

those feelings much beyond what is usual. I of course allude to the very high character so justly gained by your elder son, who in literary fame, as well as every amiable quality of the heart, stands in the estimation of the College and all who know him *secundus nulli*; while I know of no circumstance attending your younger son which can justly create any alloy in your feelings of parental exultation, for he is possessed of good abilities, and will be found with attainments far beyond the generality of boys of his years. Respecting Renn, you will easily call to your recollection what my predictions of him uniformly were, and will readily allow me, I am persuaded, a due portion of self-gratulation in having been so true a prophet. Of his extraordinary honours obtained in the general examinations last year, you were long ago informed; but the hopes and fears which must have agitated his own mind for the fate of his Prize Essay which he left behind him, his natural modesty and diffidence (I am inclined to think) prompted him to conceal from you till the news of its success afforded you a mutual and simultaneous cause of congratulation.

May I request you to thank your elder son on our account for the favour of his letter written off Madeira?

Your faithful and obedient servant,

M. ROWLANDSON.

In 1814 he was elected a Fellow of his College—one of the most coveted and contested honours in the University.

Many vacations were spent at Oxford, but he occasionally visited Bath, not on account of its being at that time a fashionable resort, but because he had friends there, the chief attraction probably being that his cousin Mary Lovell—whom he married shortly after taking his degree—resided there with her mother, the widow of Edward Lovell, Esq. He was also on terms of intimate acquaintance with her two brothers, Edward and Philip Lovell, who were then in residence at Jesus College, Cambridge. While at Bath he occasionally accompanied these friends to the theatre, where Mrs. Siddons was acting in Shakespeare. He always remembered the vivid impression he then received of her genius. He also gratified his taste

for music by going to hear some of the great singers, especially those who sang in sacred music.*

A lady who remembers him well, from having met him often at this time, gives the following account of his general personal appearance: 'He had dark, bright eyes that kindled with animation; a clear, brown complexion; dark, straight hair, the forehead peculiarly open; a well-proportioned figure, though not tall, and a finely-shaped leg and foot. These last were more remarked in those days, when gentlemen always dressed in the evening in a manner that showed the advantage or disadvantage of such proportions. In manner he was always diffident and retiring, rather shrinking from observation than courting it; but once interested in conversation, he talked with ease and cheerfulness. He never used exaggerated expressions, either of approbation or disapprobation. He often appeared to me to be in thought far away from what was going on around. You could not look at him, even when silent, without saying to yourself, "That's a clever man!"'†

The following sketches—the one by Bishop Hinds, the other by Mr. Robert Ingham, both Oxford contemporaries of Hampden, and the latter a member and Fellow of the same College—besides furnishing the valuable testimony of those with whom he associated at this time both in the University and in vacation rambles, have an interest of their own from the acknowledged ability and high public character of the writers. The second of the two sketches was not written with any view to publication; but the feeling it manifests is so natural and generous, and the touches of character are so true, that its informality cannot but lend it additional interest:—

* He has said, 'One is almost inclined to envy Handel the intense pleasure he must have felt in the composition of the *Messiah*.'

† In later years, when his hair was white and thin, the line of the brow was very striking, from being so firmly and yet so delicately marked, and adding to the effect of the massiveness of the forehead that rose above it.

From Bishop Hinds.

London: Sept. 2, 1868.

My dear ——, —Illnesses, and more pressing demands on me during their intervals, have obliged me to delay responding to your request that I would contribute something to the memoir of your father and my valued friend. Not that I can now send you any striking anecdotes of him. Indeed, his course of life during the period when we were most together would hardly furnish any, were my memory fresher than it is. I may, however, give you my impression of some traits of his character which may be interesting to you. . . .

It was during our undergraduate course at Oxford that I saw most of him. He was, at that time, remarkable for steady and correct conduct, never being betrayed into any of the excesses or follies of young men; and had withal a sedateness of demeanour which caused his friends to apply to him ordinarily an epithet expressive of this and of a kindly feeling together. He was 'old Hampden' amongst us. All this, combined with very studious habits, may be supposed to have made him unsocial; but he was not so—at least *in private companionship*. To give an evidence of it. We passed between two and three months together at Shanklin, in the Isle of Wight, in one of our long vacations, for the express purpose of reading. A third who started with us soon tired of the monotonous life we necessarily led, and deserted us. Others came and went, spending a few days with us; but we only held on, occupied with our books for the greater part of every day, and having no recreation beyond a *tête-à-tête* walk along the seashore; never even making an excursion into other parts of the attractive scenery which was at no great distance from us. Our only acquaintance was a Mr. Hill, the clergyman, and of him we scarcely saw anything. Yet I recollect distinctly that neither of us complained of being dull, and lacking more society. *In public*, and *in general society*, it was otherwise. There was then a shyness about him, and a disposition to withdraw within himself, which told against him. I recollect a lady, distinguished for conversational vivacity, who had sat by him at a dinner-table, and was provoked by his taciturnity, saying to me, 'I wish your friend the Bishop of Hereford would remember that

"it is a fine day," or that "the weather is cold."' To the same disposition it was, no doubt, owing that during the long period of his being a member of the House of Lords, he never once spoke. I am correct, I think, in saying this? In the earlier part of his life this habit may have been in the way of his obtaining the more rapid advancement, as his talents, learning, and sterling character deserved. When the Professorship of Hebrew was conferred on Pusey, he observed to me quietly, 'I should have much liked the appointment.' I named what he said to a common friend, who had some influence, and would certainly have exerted it to procure the appointment for him. The reply was, 'I never knew that Hampden understood Hebrew. If he will keep his light under a bushel, how are his friends to know anything about it?'

It might have been expected that his was just the character for enabling a man to glide through life without provoking ill-will or opposition from any. If it proved to be far otherwise, the storm of persecution which he encountered brought out, if I mistake not, Christian gifts which would not otherwise have had the same exercise. A little before it began we were separated, he remaining at the University, to which we had both returned after a long interval of absence, and I going, first to Ireland, and afterwards to a living in Hertfordshire, and I subsequently saw him only occasionally; but I recollect on one occasion, when I went to Oxford to support him with my vote in a party struggle affecting him, I was struck with the calmness and patience with which he seemed to meet the violence by which he was assailed. If he felt his hard usage acutely, as he must have done, he certainly did not parade his wounded feelings before even his intimate friends on whose sympathy he might have relied.

I have not, of course, attempted to delineate his character, but only to sketch some features of it for that full portrait which can be filled in by none so well as by you, and those who, with you, composed his earthly home, and have been trained in it for that in which you look forward some day to be once more with him.

Believe me, my dear ———, yours very truly,

S. Hinds.

From Robert Ingham, Esq., Q.C.

Westoe, South Shields: July 13, 1869.

My dear——,—Before writing down some of those recollections of my early companionship with your dear father, which, you tell me, it gratifies you to hear, I looked at the 'Oxford Calendar,' that I might be accurate as to our comparative standing. I found we were not so near together as I had thought, as your father got his double first-class in 1813, and I was not examined till the Easter of 1815. We were nearer in age, both I think being born in 1793; but your father's proficiency had been such as to gain him his honours before the usual time, and such also had been the case with John Keble.

I think your father never was at a public school, but he had such a love of work, and such faculties of acquisition, that his success in the schools was never doubted. After his triumph in the schools, he gained the Oriel Fellowship in 1814, and went out to Barbadoes; but before he went he wrote for the Latin Essay, and gained the prize in his absence, and at the Commemoration the Essay had to be read by a substitute. . . .

In 1815, after my examination and his return from Barbadoes, we were much together, he residing at Oriel as a 'Probationary Fellow,' and I preparing myself for my fellowship examination in the next year.

In the vacation we had an enjoyable expedition to the Lakes. We fixed on Penrith as our place of meeting; and I had arranged that we should take up our first quarters with the father of a school and college friend of mine, Mr. Hassell, of Dalemaine, between Penrith and Ullswater. Mr. Hassell had a numerous family, and when your father found that I knew none of the party but the Oriel undergraduate, the eldest son, he thought it so unseemly that such an irruption should be made on the family by two strangers, that he would not budge, and, as I remember, the contest between us was ended by my throwing the baggage into a donkey-cart, which trotted off with it, and we had to follow. . . .

When at Keswick, we found Southey was there. Davison had given us an introduction to him, and again Hampden's repugnance to anything verging on the aggressive was too

much for him; and on looking round after I had rapped at the door, I saw him skipping over the bushes and strawberry-beds, and making his way to the garden gate. Southey had Davison's letter, and knew your father's career, and of course respected him all the more for a modesty which was not altogether habitual with University prizemen. Southey liked it, and sent by me a pleasant note to him, in which Southey offered himself to breakfast with us the next morning. He did so, and gave us some admirable routes, including unfrequented paths to Ennerdale and Wastwater, which now form parts of every tour, but fifty-four years ago were almost unknown. From Keswick we went to Lowood on Windermere—then a single house, more of a farm than an hotel, and within a short distance of Bowness; we went to Bowness Church, and there we found in the next pew to us three other Oriel men—Tyler, Greene (afterwards member for Lancaster), and Huntley, who was elected to All Souls. We spent two days very happily together, though at first there was much anxiety from a cause which at the present day will be almost thought incredible. We met towards the end of June 1815, when we had received the first tidings of Waterloo—a glorious victory, but dearly won—and no official statement had been made of the killed and wounded. Huntley knew that his brother's regiment had been in the action, but nothing further; and the communication between London and the Lake District was then so imperfect, and the towns were so ill-provided with what are now considered necessaries of life, that no daily newspaper could be found. Old Tyler, always helpful, set off, unknown to us, and called on Wordsworth, at Rydale, thinking it sure he would be civilised enough to take in the 'Courier.' So it proved; and in the despatch Huntley's brother was reported as 'slightly wounded'—the happiest tidings that a brother could read!

Before we left Lowood, we had a long circuit by Coniston, and some secondary lakes. At Coniston we knew that in the preceding long vacation Whately had been with Willis and some others on a reading party. They did nothing, according to our host's report, but blow a horn on the lake, and clatter over the pavement in clog-shoes, which we treasured up against Whately when we met in the common room. We had had a severe day on foot before we made our afternoon's halt at

Coniston, and there were several miles before us ere we could regain our head quarters at Lowood. We asked if they had any ponies at Coniston. 'Certainly!' and to our consternation they brought out two heavy cart-horses, of which mine had been the 'wheel' horse of the team, and, to Hampden's great amusement, could not be coaxed or urged out of its accustomed order, with its nose on the tail of his horse, instead of going sociably side by side. . . .

The day following our return to Mr. Hassell's kindly roof was a memorable day. I rose early, and walked to Penrith to get letters which had been accumulating for a week. When I asked for the Dalemaine letters, the master called me in to show me an official message which had reached him from Liverpool, saying that Louis XVIII. had been proclaimed at Paris, and that Buonaparte had renounced his authority, and that the war was over. This intelligence anticipated that which would come by the London and Glasgow night mail by a dozen hours. I hurried back with my good news, very jealous of a car-full of tourists before me lest they should turn aside to Dalemaine and baulk me of my priority of news. . . . We had been so infatuated by the marvels of Buonaparte's return from Elba, and the devotedness of the army, that the great day of Waterloo had not assured us against the probability of his still making head again; and it was not until these later tidings that we felt a certainty of peace. . . .

From Newcastle we went down to a house I have in the village of Westoe, and we had a day or two of rambling along the coast, and there we parted. 'Parted, greatly to my sorrow.' There is no surer test of the solid value of a companion than being side by side for weeks together. Hampden stood the test well, through all the vicissitudes of a rough tour. He never was ruffled at small crosses, and though always earnest in the pursuit of his object, he was so unselfish, and with so much natural tact, that I never felt as if I had been thwarted, from the first day to the last.

Here I might stop, for your father's career soon became of public interest, and you have weighty evidence of every passage of it. Yet there are one or two reminiscences which I would still add to this garrulous story. I was at Oriel for my probationary year, as Fellow, from 1816 to 1817; and Hampden, who had early and wisely entered on married life, was resident on

his 'year of grace.' We often met in that year; and I remember spending a day with him at Faringdon, where he had a curacy, I being the first of his Oriel brethren who had seen either his bride or himself since the marriage. What a happy, merry pair they were! It was a small house, with a very 'wee' sitting-room, and the breakfast-table had to be thrust close into the fire-place; and, to make my cup and plate admissible, the tea-pot—not the tea-kettle!—had to be forced into the grate, and the tea-cups filled from it. When hearts are light and true, a small matter makes much mirth! . . .

I am ashamed of having chattered at such length; but in your welcome commission to me, you asked me to repeat 'in any form' what had interested you when —— and I were talking of the Bishop's academical life. . . .

Ever yours faithfully,

ROBERT INGHAM.

CHAPTER II.

1816-1832.

ORDINATION—MARRIAGE—CURACIES—REMOVES TO LONDON—ESSAY ON THE 'PHILOSOPHICAL EVIDENCE OF CHRISTIANITY'—LETTERS FROM BISHOP COPLESTON AND MR. DAVISON—'PAROCHIAL SERMONS'—RETURNS TO OXFORD — CONTRIBUTION TO 'ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA'—FAMILY TRIALS—APPOINTED BAMPTON LECTURER (1832)—WORK AT OXFORD—MR. BLANCO WHITE.

On December 22, 1816, Hampden was ordained deacon by the Bishop of Oxford, and on April 6 in the following year he was ordained priest by the Bishop of Chester. This ended his early life at Oxford. A parting gift from Mr. Davison on his leaving Oxford was accompanied by these words:

'My dear Hampden,—Before you leave Oxford, I hope you will find a place upon your shelf for these volumes, which I beg you to accept from me—a *Pindar*, and Lord Bacon's *Novum Organon*. I have selected them with the notion that such works were written for your use, and that the authors themselves would have wished you for one of their readers.

Yours ever truly and faithfully,

J. Davison.

Very shortly after his second ordination he married his cousin Mary Lovell, and soon after became curate of Newton, near Bath. He was subsequently curate of Blagdon in Somersetshire and Faringdon, also of Hungerford, and for some time of Hackney. His ministrations as curate were highly esteemed, and he experienced great kindness and regard from his neighbours as well as his parishioners. Even in the tumult of 1847 he was assured

that he was still affectionately remembered, and was invited to preach in more than one parish where he had not been seen since he held the curacy. While residing in Somersetshire he made the acquaintance of Mrs. Hannah More, who showed great kindliness and friendliness both to Mrs. Hampden and himself.

Afterwards, he took a house in Upper Seymour Street, in London, occupying himself with literary pursuits and often assisting his friends who had the charge of parishes in or near London. It was during this time that (in 1827) he published his 'Essay on the Philosophical Evidence of Christianity; or, the Credibility obtained to a Scriptural Revelation, from its Coincidence with the Facts of Nature.' On the title-page he places Milton's words—

> . . . What if earth
> Be but the shadow of heaven, and things therein
> Each to other like, more than on earth is thought.*

In the preface he says:—'Admiration of the celebrated treatise of Bishop Butler,—"The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature,"†—and a desire to obtain a full comprehension of the character and force of the particular evidence exemplified in that work, have been the primary inducements to the following attempt to elucidate the principle on which that evidence proceeds, and the importance of its application to such a religion as Christianity.' Further on in the same preface he says:—'It will readily be acknowledged, there is a strong *primâ facie* objection to the assertion of a philosophical theology. We appear, in holding such language, to be exceeding our proper limits, as the simple recipients of a gracious illumination from the Divine wisdom; and to be presumptuously reducing into system

* *Paradise Lost*, v. 574.

† It was at Dr. Hampden's suggestion, when he was examiner, that the *Analogy* was introduced into the B.A. examination at Oxford.

and order, where we ought rather to be devoutly ascribing, not only our measure of Divine knowledge in general, but every particular matter revealed, both in its substance and method, to the good pleasure of God. We seem to be theorising, when we ought to be obeying,—to be giving to knowledge the prerogatives of faith and love. The objection, it is trusted, will be found to apply rather to the name of philosophy, than to its right use in the study of religion. So far as the argument pursued in "The Analogy" is valid, there is a sound philosophy of religion; and it is only to that extent, and in that sense, that the assertion of it is here advanced. Nor is it only in respect of its essential nature that the evidence here investigated has been underrated; but its importance has been limited to the purpose of invalidating objections against Christianity,—its positive subserviency, as an argument to the truth of the religion, being regarded as comparatively little. This disesteem of the evidence is a result of that mistaken view of its nature already adverted to. For if it be considered merely as an argument *à priori*, it may still be triumphantly employed against an adversary, who brings objections against the religion drawn from speculations of a similar kind; but no real evidence can be obtained from it of the internal truth of the religion to which it may be applied; since it then has no foundation in nature. It is then only an *argumentum ad hominem*. This limitation, however, of the service of the evidence, whether it proceed from a wrong estimate of its nature, or not, is certainly very common among even professed admirers of "The Analogy." Probably it has arisen, in some degree, from the method pursued by Bishop Butler himself, in directing the attention of the reader, throughout the work, to the force with which the evidence repels speculative objections. To remove this misapprehension, as well as the former, a full investigation of the merits of the evidence appeared

to be demanded; that the various ways, in which it administers to the cause of Christian Revelation, might distinctly be placed before the view.'

This passage, taken from the preface to the 'Essay,' gives some account of its origin. Bishop Copleston (of Llandaff) gives the following opinion of it in a letter to the author written from the Deanery, Chester :—

Bishop Copleston to Mr. Hampden.

If I begin with saying that there is an obscurity in it, and a demand for close attention in the reader, and a repeated reading of certain parts, you must not suppose me to say or think that it is not worth all this attention and study; but I am still of opinion that the first part especially might have been rendered more perspicuous and less abstract. As I proceeded the work gained upon me, and in the part entitled 'Practical Force of the Evidence of Analogy,' I was charmed with the eloquence and beauty, both of the thoughts and of the language.

You have, I see, been a diligent reader of 'Origen against Celsus'—a favourite book of mine—and one which I have often wished were given to the world by an editor capable of appreciating and illustrating his author. Twice did I sit down with a firm resolution to read the treatise through for this purpose. But it is long and full of matter, excellent matter, yet requiring the current strictures of an editor; and long will it be before I shall possess sufficient leisure to embark in such an undertaking. But you are, I hope, not so distracted with a variety of cares and duties; and besides this, you are possessed in a much higher degree than I am of the requisites for such an undertaking. It used also to occur to me that an English translation, omitting of course or modifying some passages which are offensive to delicacy, would be a valuable work, especially if accompanied with such notes as you would be able to furnish. Pray turn this over in your mind.

Mr. Davison also writes, returning the MS. which had been submitted to him :—

The whole work is written with much acuteness and force of thought, and deserves publication. In parts of it I have

offered you some observations upon the argument, and here and there a few pencil marks as to the composition. Both the one and the other I beg you to consider as only hints to your own second thoughts, by which I wish you to be finally decided.

The letters of these men, who had both known him from the beginning of his college life, are valuable testimony to the kind feeling which his gentle nature inspired, and to the respect which his remarkable abilities had won for him even at this early period.

In the following year (1828), he published the volume of 'Parochial Sermons.' To the second edition, published in 1836, were added four short sermons which had been preached to the children of the Bath National School. Of the scope of the sermons which form the body of the volume, the author gives some general idea in the remarks that precede them. He says:—'Expositions of Scriptural truth labour under this disadvantage:—that they are obliged to express in separate parts, what, in fact, does not exist but as a whole. Whilst we set forth those views of the Divine Being, and of ourselves, which the Scriptures reveal to us, and insist on the necessity of rightly receiving them as they are developed in the Scriptures,—we appear to detach Christian sentiments from Christian actions. On the other hand, when we describe the disciple performing those actions of holiness which belong to his profession, and insist, also, on the indispensable necessity of these in order to salvation,—we appear to detach the actions from the faith of the Gospel. Hence we find some preachers, whilst they enlarge on faith as the characteristic of a Christian calling, guarding their assertions against the imputation of neglecting to enforce practical holiness:—and others again, who are diffuse in exhorting their brethren to the works of Christianity, anxiously deprecating the injurious construction, that they underrate the justifying nature of faith. But the

inconvenience is only that which arises from the very nature of a description. It is impossible to represent in words any real object, except by *successive* delineations. Hence, what when seen in itself appears, at once, in all its proportions as a whole, is severed into distinct portions; and admits of different constructions, according to the point of view, which most forcibly strikes the attention of the describer or the hearer, or which is the first or the last impression received from the description. Thus, Christian faith and Christian holiness are, in reality, but one and the same thing. They *exist* only as they are embodied and exemplified in the life of the Christian man. But in description they become different views of the individual in whom they are embodied. And, hence, they come, not only to be regarded sometimes as separate qualities of a Christian profession, but to be separately insisted on, in such a way as in turn to throw each other into shade.

'To counteract this delusion has been the anxious aim of the author. He has tried to lead his readers from abstract notions on the subject of their religion; and to show them its speculative truth and beauty as these are reflected from its practical importance. The best way, as it appears to him, of preventing the unnatural disunion of Christian faith and morals, and exhibiting them in their proper identity with each other, as they are seen *in fact*,—is; to treat them, in *discussion*, as far as possible, as *one* thing: not to be afraid of misconstruction from the use of controverted terms; but, rather, boldly to use such terms in their right comprehensive sense whenever it can be done. For the preacher then gives the impression to his hearers, that he is presenting to them different *views only* of the *same* Christian character, or different *evidences* of the kingdom of God established in the heart of the living Christian, and not parts of a Christian profession capable of existing in disunion. Whether he

dwells on faith, or repentance, or works, it is to "Christ crucified," and "raised from the dead," that he is found endeavouring to *conform* his hearers.'

A somewhat curious though trifling circumstance connected with this volume of sermons was related, by the lady to whom it occurred, to Mrs. Hampden. She had taken a house in the parish of Ewelme (the living attached to the Professorship of Divinity), just before Dr. Hampden became the rector of that parish. When she heard of the tumult raised against him at Oxford, she was greatly distressed at the prospect of being one of his parishioners; and she consulted the clergyman of the parish she was leaving. He inquired of her, if she had been satisfied with the sermons she had heard in his parish church. 'Ah!' she said, 'that is what I so much regret to leave.' 'Many of them,' he rejoined, 'have been taken from Dr. Hampden's volume of "Parochial Sermons."'

In the year 1829, at the suggestion of his friends, he returned to Oxford, living in a house in the High Street. He was appointed Examiner for the B.A. degree, and subsequently held the same office in 1831 and 1832.

About this time (1831) he contributed two articles to the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' on 'Aristotle' and 'Aristotle's Philosophy.'* The publication was edited by Professor Macvey Napier, of whose kindness in all his communications with him Dr. Hampden always spoke in the highest terms. On receipt of the articles, Mr. Napier thus wrote to the Author:—

I consider myself much obliged, and the work very much recommended, by your treatise, which is written with so thorough a knowledge of the subject, with so much judgment, and in a style which contrasts so favourably with the frothy modes of the day, that it cannot fail to promote the cause of

* Seventh edition, vol. iii. p. 490, and p. 494. The articles were afterwards enlarged, and published separately by Messrs. Black, of Edinburgh, with an article on Plato and one on Socrates, subsequently written for the same publication.

good learning, and to secure the good opinion of its cultivators throughout the reading world.

At this period also he contributed an article to the 'Encyclopædia Metropolitana,' on Thomas Aquinas and the Scholastic Philosophy. This article appears to have excited much interest. It opened up a branch of inquiry that had been much neglected; and the subject (which might seem a dull one) is made of interest to the reader by the deep interest with which the author evidently enters into such research, and by the power and vigour of the writing. The articles were written partly in London, where he still retained his house in Seymour Street, and partly in Oxford.

These years were marked, both to Mrs. Hampden and himself, with much domestic sorrow. On his return to Oxford after several years' absence, an infant daughter died, almost suddenly, in her mother's arms. Both father and mother felt this deeply; and having laid their child's body in the chancel of St. Mary's Church in Oxford, they returned for a while to London. But there a similar sorrow fell upon them, another little girl, scarcely two years old, being taken from them; and they brought her from London and laid her beside the baby-sister.

Mrs. Hampden always remembered the manner in which the funeral service had been read on this occasion by Mr. Newman, then Vicar of St. Mary's. His remarkable power of giving expression to the grand words of the burial service was long recollected by most of those who followed these children's remains to the grave in the beautiful Church of St. Mary the Virgin.

In 1832 Mr. Hampden was appointed Bampton Lecturer, the appointment being in the hands of the Vice-Chancellor and Heads of Houses.

He now established himself more permanently in Oxford, living in a house in St. Giles's; and taking private pupils, young men who were reading for their B.A. degree.

Mrs. Hampden, who sometimes heard these private lectures from an adjoining room, accused him of being a bad private tutor, as he was so eager and interested in the reading: 'he told' before the pupil had time to reply to his questions. He had a strong and individual interest in his pupils, and his kindly feeling seems (with few exceptions) to have been returned by them, many in after life asking for his counsel and advice in moments of difficulty and anxiety.

He undertook about this time, at the request of the Provost, a tutorship in his own College, Oriel. Dr. Whately was then principal of St. Alban's Hall, so that there was still a remnant of the Oriel 'set' in Oxford. Mr. Blanco White had also been admitted a member of the college. All who knew this remarkable man seem to have felt the charm of his society. His gentleness of disposition and fondness for children made him a welcome guest in the family circle. On the occasion of a morning call on Mr. and Mrs. Hampden, he met on the staircase the few-weeks'-old baby of the family, who was being taken in the nurse's arms for his morning walk. Bending over the child, he implored so solemn a blessing upon him that the nurse, struck by the unusual earnestness of his manner, returned to tell the mother of it: 'He did say it so hearty—it must do the baby good.' Mrs. Hampden used also to speak of her interest and pity being excited by hearing him talk of his distressed state of mind with regard to his religious feelings. He would say that, having knelt down to pray, such was his agitation of mind that he could not do so, but had to rise from his knees madly distracted by contending emotions.

During Mr. Hampden's residence in St. Giles's, Oxford, he paid a visit to his former college tutor, Mr. Davison, at his living. It was the last time they met. Mr. Hampden felt his death to be the loss of one whose counsel he honoured, and of whose regard he felt assured.

CHAPTER III.

1832–1833.

THE 'BAMPTON LECTURES'—LETTERS OF THE BISHOP OF KILDARE AND ARCHDEACON HARE — APPOINTED PRINCIPAL OF ST. MARY HALL — RECOLLECTIONS OF DR. HAMPDEN BY THE REV. WILLIAM SINCLAIR — DR. HAMPDEN AT ST. MARY HALL — STATE OF THE COLLEGE — IMPROVEMENTS EFFECTED.

THE subject of the series of lectures or sermons which were preached before the University by Mr. Hampden in 1832 is 'The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its relation to Christian Theology.' He felt the inquiry to be one of deep interest, especially at a time when the general spirit of inquiry and the more enlarged means of education at once call forth and strengthen the power of pursuing it. In his view, it was of the utmost importance that it should be accompanied by well-directed and intelligent study. In the second lecture he speaks of the line proposed to be taken in the course of lectures. In the previous lecture he had shown the origin of the Scholastic Philosophy; he now purposes 'to explain the nature of that philosophy itself, when it became the acknowledged system of the Church; to give some account of its formation; and of the general character of the theology resulting from it.' A little further on he continues:—'The subject immediately before us, is one of the most serious interest to all, who have a just concern for the maintenance of sound practical Christianity. We are now tracing to its origin that speculative logical Christianity, which survives among us at this day; and which has been in all ages the principal obstacle, as I conceive, to the union and peace of the Church of Christ. To some indeed

the assertion may even seem strange, that the cause of Christianity has suffered to such an extent, from the *logical* character of the speculations adopted into its system. They may readily admit in general terms, that the intermixture of any speculation whatever with the body of religious truth, must be detrimental to that truth. But they may not be aware, at the same time, of the mischief arising from the merely *logical* character of the speculation. It will be the object of the whole of the present course of lectures to point out this mischief. But in order that I may carry my hearers along with me throughout in my design, I would place in the front of the observations now to be submitted, the nature of that evil which Scholasticism embodies in it,—the evil of a Logical Theology.' Again, he says :—'If then it should appear, that the Scholastic Philosophy was in its fundamental character, a Logical Theology, the nature of that evil which it has imported into Religion, will be sufficiently apparent. And antecedently to our entering into the examination of particular points, the reason will be seen in general, of that vast apparatus of technical terms, which Christian Theology now exhibits. It will appear, that, whilst theologians of the schools have thought they were establishing religious truth by elaborate argumentation, they have been only multiplying and arranging a theological language. Nor let it be thought that the evil has rested here ;—that the mere futility of the process has worked its own antidote. Experience tells us that it has not rested here. The signs have been converted into things. The combination and analysis of words which the Logical Theology has produced, have given occasion to the passions of men to arm themselves in defence of the phantoms thus called into being. Not only have professed theologians, but private Christians, been imposed on, by the specious religion of terms of theology; and have betrayed often a fond zeal in the service of their

idol-abstractions, not unlike that of the people of old, who are said to have beaten the air with spears, to expel the foreign gods by whom their country was supposed to be occupied.* For my part, I believe it to be one of the chief causes of the infidelity which prevails among speculative men. Notions are proposed to them which they feel themselves competent to examine with freedom; because they have an instinctive perception of the source from which they are derived. Every one who reflects at all, has some knowledge of metaphysical truth; for it is the truth that is most intimate with him. And when a reflecting person, accordingly, has notions proposed to him, which he finds to be part of the internal stock of principles belonging to his nature, he is led to compare them with each other, to discern contrarieties, and to reject what perplexes and confounds him. Premising these observations, with the view of keeping steadily before the attention, the object, not only of this lecture in particular, but of the whole course; and as a general index to the remarks which I shall be continually directing to the same point; I proceed now, to give a sketch of the progress of Christian Theology to that state, from which the evil consequences adverted to have flowed.'†

A letter from the Bishop of Kildare to Archbishop Whately, though written some years later, may find a place here, as containing an account of his impressions on reading the 'Bampton Lectures.'

The Bishop of Kildare to Archbishop Whately.

March 12, 1836.

My dear Lord,—Your grace this day imposed on me an honourable task; namely, to state what were the impressions left on my mind after reading Dr. Hampden's 'Bampton Lectures.' I obey your will by observing that I read those discourses,

* Herodotus, in his account of the Caunians.

† Third edition, Lecture ii. pp. 53–56.

notes and quotations, with very deep interest. To give an opinion upon a book of the deepest logical and pneumatological discussion, without reading it a second time, would be highly presumptuous. Were I to venture it even then, I should be diffident of my capability to judge it; but every man of decent theological reading must have an impression of an author's design; and mine is that he stated the system of the schoolmen with ability and impartiality, giving no formal opinions of his own, making only such remarks as were incidental to his subject, and committing to men learned and matured in judgment, the fairest invitation to canvass the deep metaphysical subjects which were thus opened to the notice of the Churches of Rome, England, Geneva, not omitting Lutheran Congregations; all of whom in some degree, more or less, seem still to be influenced by the language adopted by the schoolmen. To this point I arrived in my first reading of this very abstruse, and I may say, difficult work; but the eager discussion—too eager, I fear, for fair controversy—that seems suddenly, since the late promotion of the author, to have soured the energies of many zealous persons, will undoubtedly delay for a time a course of study which some considerations, derived from Dr. Hampden's views concerning the language of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds had imposed upon me; and I shall forthwith apply myself to his work with renewed attention.

I have the honour, &c.

CHARLES KILDARE.

The 'Bampton Lectures' were preached to very large congregations. That they were listened to with universal interest is fully proved by the many letters received by Mr. Hampden in which they are mentioned—not mere letters of compliment, but the letters of inquiring students whose interest had been excited in the subject brought before them.

It may be as well to notice here a statement that has been repeated with a parrot-like pertinacity. For an oft-repeated assertion, though unfounded in fact, will at last leave an impression on the memory that it is true, because it is so familiar. People forget that this repetition

is constantly practised for such a purpose, as for instance, in the familiar case of advertisements. The statement referred to is that the 'Bampton Lectures' were in part or wholly written by Mr. Blanco White.

A forcible contradiction to this untrue statement is contained in the letter addressed by Archdeacon Hare to the Dean of Chichester, in which he says:—

As I have been led to speak of the relation in which Dr. Hampden's philosophy stands to Butler's, let me add, that this fact entirely disproves the doubts which have so strangely been thrown on the authorship of the Bampton Lectures. An ingenious writer in 'The Times,' wishing, as it would seem, to try how far the credulity of his readers would follow him, has made out a regular history, garnisht with dates and anecdotes, to prove that the Bampton Lectures were not written by Dr. Hampden, but by Blanco White,—that they are 'as much the product of Mr. B. White's mind, as certain works penned by Xenophon and Plato are virtually the thoughts of Socrates. There is indeed (he allows) a considerable difference of style between the Lectures and Mr. B. White's publisht works, even on the same subjects.' This, however, does not startle him; for, 'they who were acquainted with that extraordinary person, will remember that he talkt and wrote very differently. He spoke with vigour and terseness; and with his eye upon his subject.' . . . . Had this piece of conjectural history been confined to a daily newspaper, it would hardly have deserved serious notice, however great the influence of that newspaper may be. But it has been reprinted, as though it were authentic, in monthly and quarterly journals, and has found credence, as any story will, if there are a number of echoes to repeat it. Of course too its effect, if not its benevolent design, has been to breed the suspicion that the Bampton Lectures convey Blanco White's errours. As to the fact, after the conclusive contradiction it has received from the Archbishop of Dublin, who can speak with more authority than any man living on this subject, it would be worse than *actum agere*, for me, ignorant as I am of the times and persons, to say anything. But it may not be superfluous to observe, that the 'Essay on the Philosophical Evidence of Christianity,' which I believe, was Dr. Hampden's first work,

and was published in 1827, that is, four or five years anterior to the period when our fabulist surmises that he was drinking in inspiration at the feet of his Spanish Gamaliel, is written manifestly and confessedly with the view of carrying out and applying the principles of Butler's 'Analogy,' and contains the germs of the chief speculations in the Bampton Lectures. They too who are at all acquainted with the writing of what was then called the Oriel School, will easily perceive that the Bampton Lectures, in their whole tone of thought, both philosophical and theological, are a genuine birth of that school, and did not need a refugee from Seville to graft them into it. Moreover, though our feelings and opinions are sure to be modified more or less by those with whom we live in familiarity, and so far Dr. Hampden's may have been by his intercourse with Blanco White, there is a unity in the tone and spirit of the work, which bespeaks the unity of its author. Its learning too bespeaks original research, altogether independent of the French writers, who are asserted, on no adequate grounds, to have supplied the materials for it.*

Mrs. Hampden often spoke of her husband's great power of self-abstraction, and said that while writing the Bampton Lectures, his young children were often playing noisily round him. They were at all times welcomed to his study. He wrote (that is, in the actual penmanship) with great rapidity, though always in a distinct, good hand. On would go the pen, faster and faster, as the thoughts crowded themselves one on the other; he would use the pen first in the usual manner, and then, when it would 'go' no longer, turn it and use the back; sometimes a slight expression of impatience escaping him when it *would* 'go' no longer.

The mental effort was great, as the Lectures, though forming a continuous whole, had to be so divided as to form so many distinct parts, each to be ready at a stated

* *Postscript to the second edition of Archdeacon Hare's Letter to the Dean of Chichester*, p. 91.

time. Soon after the publication the writer's health suffered considerably from the overstrain. He went with his family to the Isle of Wight, which was always a favourite spot of his, and to which he more than once resorted, always with fresh pleasure. No one ever went so little from home for what is called 'amusement' or 'change;' he found them both around him and within. On those rare occasions when he did leave home for such a purpose, it was only because his children's or his own health made it simply necessary to do so.

In April 1833, he was offered the Headship of St. Mary Hall by the Chancellor, Lord Grenville,* who certainly did not make the offer until he had inquired into Mr. Hampden's fitness for this responsible office. 'When,' wrote Lord Grenville, 'I heard of Dr. Dean's lamented death, my first impression was that you were the person who should be appointed to succeed him, if you should be disposed to take that duty upon you. All that I have since learned on the subject has only tended to confirm my opinion of the propriety of this choice.'

No better introduction to Dr. Hampden's life as Principal of St. Mary Hall, can be given than in the words of the Rev. William Sinclair. Mr. Sinclair was a member of that society at the time; and Dr. Hampden—always a ready observer of character—formed a high opinion of him, which was confirmed after longer acquaintance. Later, when Rector of Ewelme, it was his earnest wish to have his former pupil and friend as his

* The late Duke of Sutherland (a large landowner in the Diocese of Hereford) wrote to the Bishop in 1847, with great kindness expressing satisfaction at his appointment to the See, and adding, that he knew the high opinion, founded on the best authority, entertained by Lord Grenville of Dr. Hampden at the time of his appointment to St. Mary Hall. The Duke also expressed his belief that the publication of the pamphlet in favour of the admission of Dissenters to the University, which he considered had stirred up the acrimony of others, would have had no prejudicial effect on Lord Grenville's mind.

fellow-worker and curate. Speaking of him familiarly, he used to say, 'A fine manly character is William Sinclair.' Mr. Sinclair writes :—

'When I resolved to take a degree at Oxford, I entered at St. Mary Hall, of which Dr. Dean was at that time Principal. The Hall was intended not so much for young men fresh from school, as for students of a more advanced age, who had from any reason been prevented from entering college at the usual early period of life. On the death of Dr. Dean, which occurred during my undergraduate course, I felt, in common with other members of the Hall, some alarm on hearing that so eminent a scholar, or, as we said among ourselves, "so great a gun," as Dr. Hampden had been appointed his successor. But we soon were most agreeably undeceived, by finding ourselves under the care of an estimable and most amiable man, thoroughly prepared to interest himself in all our studies and pursuits. He examined us from time to time, and gave us lectures occasionally on classical subjects, but principally on divinity ; so that the Hall, which had been an easy-going, gentlemanly place of resort, became a place of real work and hard study.

'Some time previous to his appointment he had been editor of an orthodox Church Magazine, and curate in South Hackney to an eminently orthodox divine, the Rev. H. H. Norris, brother-in-law of the late Joshua Watson. Dr. Hampden's lectures and teaching were in accordance with the "Parochial Sermons" which he had previously published. I never traced in them the slightest taint of neology. Although reserved in general society, he could unbend even among younger men, with whom he had frequent intercourse, and then pour forth without reserve a large amount of valuable information. I frequently partook of his hospitality, and sometimes had the gratification of meeting persons of great eminence in scholarship and philosophy ; and the party of which I

retain most distinct remembrance was one in which Mr. Nassau Senior, the political economist, and others of the like calibre were present and had a discussion on the topic of the day—the Poor Law, and opened up to me such views as I can never forget of the mischievous consequences of indiscriminate charity, as encouraging the very evil which it pretended to diminish.

'I well remember seeing the Doctor come into his study, flushed with excitement and with a little tract in his hand. It was one of the well-known "Tracts for the Times." His remark upon it was: "These gentlemen, without even knowing it, have passed the Rubicon; they do not see that they are already Romanists."

'When I was at St. Mary Hall, the Nonconformists were alleged to be betraying unaccountable hostility to the Church. Dr. Hampden remarked, that their conduct ought to be regarded with indulgence; for they had come forward with a kind of chivalrous alacrity to support the Church in 1666, and had not received from Churchmen the return of gratitude they were entitled to. He added, that their policy now, in joining with factious politicians, with whatever indulgence it might be regarded, was highly indiscreet, and almost suicidal; for it would be ruinous to them to be looked upon as political partizans, rather than as Christian Ministers.

'Among Dr. Hampden's most valued friends was Dr. Shuttleworth, Warden of New College, and afterwards Bishop of Chichester. Dr. S., like Dr. Hampden, was in politics a Whig, and never but on one occasion deviated from the consistent support of his party. Dr. Hampden did not consider him, in that instance, to have evinced his usual discretion. The case was this: Sir Robert Peel had come into power under circumstances of great difficulty and embarrassment; with the view of obtaining for him a fair trial, an address was got up from moderate men, and Dr. Shuttleworth was persuaded to sign it.

This untoward signature very nearly debarred him from the episcopate; for when Dr. S. candidly announced it to Lord Holland, his political ally, that veteran Whig replied, "I wish the pen had been red-hot, when you took it in hand for such a purpose."

'While I was at St. Mary Hall, Sir William Hamilton, for whom Dr. Hampden had a high consideration, published some of his attacks on Oxford. Sir William alleged that he had attacked Oxford not because it was the weakest, but because it was the strongest of the Universities, and would have more to say than any other in its own vindication. The Principal went to some extent in the same direction with Sir William, but was of opinion that the Baronet greatly undervalued the collegiate system, and the value of classical as well as mathematical studies. Dr. Hampden conceived that the mathematical studies had a greater tendency to expand the intellect than Sir William allowed, and he maintained that classical knowledge should in all cases be made the basis upon which the superstructure of other knowledge should rest. Far from imagining it to be of no consequence how and when and where a young man acquired knowledge, he contended that a college life, and a constant collision of minds under the wise and watchful superintendence of an able tutor, and the regularity of fixed academic hours, and habitual attendance of Divine Service, all combined to form what no other country in the world can produce—the English gentleman and scholar.

'These are but slight reminiscences of so good and eminent a man; but I shall always retain a grateful remembrance of the kindness and encouragement I received from him during my undergraduate course; for his kind wish that I should become his curate at Ewelme; and so long as he lived I was gratified to enjoy his friendship.'

Not only in point of discipline, but in all the requisites of a collegiate institution, St. Mary Hall was in a deplorable state when Mr. Hampden was appointed to the headship. It was little else than a sort of comfortable hotel; its funds were in a most embarrassed state; the buildings, including the chapel, were almost in a ruinous condition. The new Principal had no easy task before him. Still in a short time, by his own unaided exertions, the whole aspect of the place was changed; and under his rule as Principal, a first-class in the degree examination was for the first time gained by St. Mary Hall. Indeed, he laboured unceasingly in the instruction of the members, giving lectures himself in all departments. At his own expense the chapel was restored, and made fit for divine service; the Principal's lodgings (as the residence is called in Oxford) were rebuilt; and other parts of the building were restored and beautified, at the cost of at least 4,000*l.* He took the greatest pleasure and interest in watching the improvements both within and without; he loved to see things gradually taking shape and order. 'I wish to leave everything better than I find it,' he was used to say.

CHAPTER IV.

1833–1835.

QUESTION OF 'TESTS' AT OXFORD—DR. HAMPDEN'S 'OBSERVATIONS ON DISSENT'—LETTER FROM DR. ARNOLD—DR. HAMPDEN TO ARCHBISHOP WHATELY—APPOINTED PROFESSOR OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY (1834)—'MORAL PHILOSOPHY LECTURES'—PROPOSED OFFER OF A BISHOPRIC (1835)—UNIVERSITY TESTS—LETTER TO MR. NASSAU SENIOR.

At the beginning of the year 1834, the subject of the abolition of 'tests' on admission to the University was first brought under notice; and it was proposed in Convocation that a 'declaration of assent' should be substituted for the subscription then in use. This proposal, however, was rejected by a considerable majority. A formal protest to the following effect was put forth by some members of Convocation: 'We earnestly deprecate any such substitution, as pernicious in itself, and of dangerous precedent.' The names subscribed to this paper are, almost to a man, the same as those which two years later appeared in a protest against Dr. Hampden's appointment to the Regius Professorship of Divinity.

Dr. Hampden's pamphlet, entitled 'Observations on Religious Dissent,' was written at this time to advocate the admission of Dissenters to the University for the purpose of education.* After giving his view of the case, he says: 'I do not scruple, therefore, to avow myself favourable to a removal of all tests, so far as they are employed

* It is remarkable that many of Dr. Hampden's ideas, and the views taken by him, which at the time were opposed by others as dangerous, and which drew down upon him so large a share of unpopularity, have since been adopted by almost universal consent as indispensable.

as securities of orthodoxy among our members at large. Tests are no part of religious *education*; if they were, I should think we were justified in retaining them; they are merely boundaries of exclusion. It has been asserted by an able and candid writer, Archdeacon Powell * (and since by others), that subscription to articles is analogous to teaching a child to say the Creed before it can understand it. The instances are not parallel. They are not illustrations of the same principle. By teaching the Creed we commence the *education* of the child. We do not mean to exclude other children; but we simply educate our own in that way, giving him some leading facts of Christianity to be learned. But tests at admission to the University are exclusions, and nothing more. They form no element of education. They are placed in the front of the education of the place; but this is quite a different thing, of course, from the beginning itself of the education. They may be very useful for ascertaining the competence of teachers or official persons in the University, but can be of no service to those who are to be taught. Instruction in the articles themselves *is* of use; and that I suppose is to continue, even though the tests be removed. Indeed, without any reference to dissenters, it would be well for our own members if the form of subscribing at matriculation, or on any occasion where no power or right of teaching were concerned, were done away; as the sense in which it is explained, is not of that direct, unequivocal character, which may at once satisfy all minds, and defy cavil and exception. That the tests as now used may be defended, I do not deny, and that, by persons of unquestionable sincerity and honourable feeling; but I would rather not have occasion to resort to such defences, by retaining a form, at least superfluous so far as our own members are concerned.'

* *Discourse* ii. *preached at Cambridge* in 1757, p. 40. Powell's Discourses on Various Subjects. 8vo. London, 1776.

The last words of this pamphlet contain a caution, perhaps as much needed at this time as it was thirty-five years ago: 'Let those who are not with us, see how far they are justified in requiring a deference on our part to their theological opinions; and let members of our church search and see whether their sincere zeal for the religion of Christ may not have been, unconsciously to themselves, transferred to the defence of human expositions of doctrine.'

The pamphlet had a large and ready sale, and to the second edition was added a postscript. It was written hurriedly, to stimulate, and it may be, to guide the feeling on this subject, that was even then rising into vigour and importance. A letter written by Dr. Arnold to Dr. Hampden, of which this pamphlet forms the subject, cannot but be read with interest.

Dr. Arnold to Dr. Hampden.

Rugby: May 17, 1835.

Dear Hampden,—I ought long since to have thanked you for your kind remembrance of me in sending me your pamphlet on 'Dissent,' and I now have to thank you for the postscript to it also. There was not, however, in this case the same reason for a speedy acknowledgment which I have heard sometimes given —that it is safer to thank for a book before you have read it, lest your conscience and your wish to be civil should afterwards be rather at variance with one another. Indeed I had not anticipated, much as I had admired your 'Bampton Lectures,' that your sentiments on so many points should be so much in agreement with my own, or that I should have the honour of sharing with you the abuse of the British critic. Your view of the difference between Christian Truth and Theological Opinion is one which I have long cherished, and which I fondly look to as the means, under God, of bringing the Church of Christ to the only unity that is at once practicable and desirable,—that only unity which Christ and Christ's Apostles ever designed for it. And for this view of the curable nature of all dif-

ferences between Christians, I am inclined to open the University to all Dissenters; not that I would admit any man to my college who would object to attend my religious worship and instruction, but because I conceive tests are purely injurious; and that in lecturing on the Scriptures alone, all Christian truth would come out full and genuine, while much of theological and party opinion went, as it ought to do, to the dogs. Conceive the absurdity of requiring all the tutors in Oxford to subscribe to some thirty-nine articles on the Aristotelean philosophy, as all deduced faithfully by Andronicus and others from the works of Aristotle. Would not the answer be, we lecture on Aristotle himself, we interpret him faithfully to the best of our power; if we are competent to our business, we cannot mistake his meaning in all the principal points of his philosophy; particular passages no doubt will remain uncertain; but did Andronicus or any of the earlier commentators know any more about this than we do? It is impossible for any man to resist the application of this language to the interpretation of the Scriptures, unless he really means, as half the High Church party in their ignorance and inconsistency do, to rest on the rotten staff of a pretended tradition.

I hope to be in Oxford on Wednesday, and vote with you in favour of the declaration. But I believe that we shall be beaten, and I can hardly regret it, being convinced that Oxford now is like Oxford in the sixteenth century, and will never be reformed effectually except from without. I often think of the instructive fact, that the Reformation was carried by a reforming Government supported by a small minority of the clergy, against the majority of the clergy, the country gentlemen, and the populace.

Believe me to be, dear Hampden, ever very sincerely yours,

T. Arnold.

Some murmurs of disapprobation seem to have reached Archbishop Whately at this time, and with his straightforward kindliness he must have made them known to Dr. Hampden; at least, so it would appear from the following letter.

Dr. Hampden to Archbishop Whately.

St. Mary Hall: October 31, 1835.

I am really happy in an opportunity of clearing up a construction of my conduct which, from your mention of it, seems to have got abroad. Perhaps the best way of doing so will be to commence with explaining to you what I conceive to have been the occasion of such an opinion having been taken up respecting me. I cannot but think that a certain reservedness of disposition, a defect of which I am perfectly sensible, and which I am daily labouring to overcome in myself, has given to some the appearance of pride and an arrogance of independence —feelings which often manifest themselves by an air of reserve, but which I do not acknowledge in my own case. I confess it as a fault which I ought to remedy, if it were only for the pain which it gives to myself and the prejudices which I am aware it must excite against me. But I do not hold it of *malice*, and, as I have said, I am anxiously trying to mend it. At any rate, the not speaking out one's own feelings and sentiments with regard to others, on occasions which demand it, lays one open to misconstructions which an opposite conduct might avoid. I may indeed have carried something of the same fault into my publications; probably I have, if there is any truth in the French proverb, *le style c'est l'homme*. But I must say of these, as I say of my conduct generally, I have not studied such an effect; and so far as appears to myself, I have in a great measure obviated it, especially in my later publications. But whatever may be the grounds on which the opinion has been formed that I affect a spirit of originality and independence of opinion, allow me most sincerely to assure you that I am quite unconscious of being actuated by such a spirit in that faulty degree and manner to which your censure justly applies. I have certainly tried to think for myself, and have had a fondness for taking up subjects of discussion which appeared to me not to have been fully treated before, because they coincided with my turn of mind, or stimulated my curiosity more than some others. At the same time I have not pursued the study with the *vanity* of an independent thinker. I have always sought every information that I could obtain, whether from books or conversation, and have taken care where I remembered it,

distinctly to refer to the source of my information—not with the view simply of avoiding the imputation of plagiarism, but often for the purpose of leading those who might be so disposed to examine the points referred to in the authorities themselves. I cannot disclaim wishing to establish for myself a literary reputation; but, if I know myself rightly, my wishes do not terminate in this, nor do I put it in competition with the duty of promoting the public good independently of self, by whatever hands it may be effected. Again I may assure you with regard to receiving advice and adopting suggestions from others, I am disposed, not only to listen to opinions kindly given, but even to ask for the judgment of others, though it sometimes has required on my part a sacrifice, not of pride or independence, but of that reluctance which I have felt to intrude myself on the attention of another. In fact, I consider consultation with others, learning what views are taken by different minds of the same subject, and observing in what light our own opinions are regarded by them, among the necessary means for arriving at the truth. I am only sorry that any part of my conduct should have given a contrary impression to any one. I have never indeed spoken or thought disparagingly of authority as a guide to truth, except, as on a late occasion here, when an improper stress was laid on authority, and it was treated as a substitute for examination into grounds of conviction. Nor have I that extreme confidence in my own opinion as to like to stand alone, or to feel quite at ease in differing from those whose judgment I value. To refer, for instance, to one whose memory I am not single in loving and revering—Davison; I find myself constantly recurring in thought to him as a master, and asking myself what he would have thought on this or that question. What I have said of him, might be applied in different degrees to other friends still living. So far from dreading the appearance of following their direction, or taking up their ideas at second hand, I have been and shall always be, most ready to receive and act upon to the best of my judgment any suggestion proceeding from them. In particular, with regard to yourself, there is no one to whose opinion I am more disposed to defer, because I am fully persuaded that whatever you may advance is sincerely thought and meant, as well as the result of much larger, and more acute

observation than I can pretend to. I would not say this on an ordinary occasion, lest I should seem to exceed the modesty which becomes me in writing to you. But I shall be excused as defending myself from a misconstruction of my character, and as wishing to put you in possession of the real state of the case. I have, however, spoken the honest truth—nothing more than I really feel. Once more let me thank you for the kind frankness of your communications to me on this occasion.

In 1834 the Professorship of Moral Philosophy became vacant, and Dr. Hampden was appointed to it by the Vice-Chancellor (Dr. Rowley), the Dean of Christ Church, the Presidents of Magdalen and St. John's Colleges, and the Proctors, in whose hands the election was lodged. The lectures he delivered as Professor were published soon after, and are said to have been largely made use of by candidates for classical honours in the University. They were written with a view to create a real interest in the subject among the younger members, whose course of University study obliges them to have at least a formal acquaintance with moral philosophy. 'My chief design,' he says, 'in publishing these lectures, as it was in the delivery of them, is to put the student of the ancient philosophers on his guard against the natural effect of the system in which he is trained. I do not condemn that system in itself, for I think it most desirable that such works as the Treatises of Aristotle should be read with that exactness which the present practice of the University enforces. But I desire to furnish him at once with a supplement and an introduction to his more exact studies;—to assist him in making his familiarity with the text of ancient philosophy subservient to a more enlarged knowledge of the interesting matter contained in it.'*

These lectures show the author's power of adapting

* Preface to *Moral Philosophy Lectures*, second edition, p. xi.

himself to those he especially addressed. His experience as Public Examiner, he says, had led him 'to observe, that something more is wanting on the part of our students, than a mere reading of the works of the ancient masters of moral science, to answer the spirit of the University requisition.' He therefore directs his hearers to the road along which they must travel, warning them against the discouragement that would naturally attend the beginning of their study of moral science, more especially when compared with physical science, with all its wonders to captivate the imagination, and awe and confound the judgment. 'Though,' he says, 'the moral philosopher has many real wonders to discourse of,—though the facts of which he treats show that man, in his internal invisible nature, is no less fearfully and wonderfully made than are the things of the universe without us;—what I would observe is, that he cannot put them in that specious form which is the alluring prerogative of the physical inquirer. He has to do with the thoughtful, the serious, the deeply attentive; he speaks to the inward ear; he paints to the inward eye. He asks for a patience of contemplation which few are disposed to give, amidst the multitude of literary pastimes with which the world seduces even the votaries of science, the painstaking of an intellect willing to toil for truth's sake, without the cheering view of a palpable result at each step.' And as he goes on enumerating the various disadvantages against which the student must arm himself, he says: 'The historian, the poet, and the novelist, have already formed the taste of the generality, and spoiled them, if I may so say, for the theoretic disquisition of the moral philosopher. They expect him to embody his truths in flesh and blood,—not only to delineate the character of man, but exhibit man himself on the scene;—not only to give general views of the condition of man, but picture that condition in "moving accidents by flood and field." The very taste,

therefore, for these studies is vitiated by the seductive lessons of the unauthoritative teachers of moral truth. We are not to wonder then, that the early moralists clothed their wisdom in parables, and fables, and apologues. Nor is it strange that Plato should have felt a jealousy of the poets, and banished them from his imaginary republic, as rivals in the art of reforming a people; bending all the force of his eloquence to teach philosophy as philosophy, and recommend the study of laws, and education, and manners, while, at the same time, he bows to the popular taste, by throwing over his abstract discussions the charms of dramatic interest, introducing exquisite fables, the traditions of an elder wisdom, the mother-tongue, which moral philosophy had learned in infancy, while nursed in the lap of religion. Nor, again, is it matter of surprise that Homer should be appealed to by the ancients as an ethical authority "fuller and better" than the oracles of the schools;* or that Horace should be familiarly cited as "the moralist" by a writer of the middle ages.'

Thus having told his hearers of the diligent and patient frame of mind in which they must approach so great a subject, he endeavours to tempt them with a picture of its grandeur and beauty: 'When once the mind can be brought fully to see the beauty and dignity of moral science, there is no interest that can compete with that which it inspires. The disadvantage under which it labours, is only at the outset. It does not appear to possess those charms which physical philosophy holds out to the world at large. The Γνῶθι Σεαυτὸν inscribed on the Delphic Temple, might have been viewed with the transient eye of one little thinking of the wisdom wrapped up in that standing oracle of the shrine. But let us only commence the work of unfolding its meaning; and we shall then find, that it involves mysteries of deeper and

* Qui, quid sit pulchrum, quid turpe, quid utile, quid non,
Planius ac melius Chrysippo et Crantore dicit.— Hor. *Ep.* i. 2, 3.

more real truth than the responses addressed, from time to time, from that shrine, to a more vulgar curiosity—truth, indeed, which as dictating those responses, and expressed in them, often gave the air of a real divination to its predictions.' *

At this time, lectures were by no means popular at Oxford. The general feeling was that attending them was a dull formality exacted by the University. That Dr. Hampden was most anxious to impress his hearers with the deep interest which he felt in the subject, is most evident; and zealously he points out the far extending boundaries, where each student may follow the track that best suits his tastes and his wants:—'Let me exhort, then, that we should proceed in that path which our University discipline of education marks out for us. "Hæ tibi erunt artes," I would say to each member of our body. Make that course of high and masculine literature which you are pursuing effectual to the refinement, and strengthening, and elevation of your minds, by combining with it the study of a sound philosophy of human nature—that knowledge, of which, by the very direction of your academical reading, you have already some of the noblest documents placed in your hands.' †

There is an animation about these lectures, so that in reading them one almost seems to hear the varying tone of the voice, as it explains, encourages, entreats, and promises reward. 'It is one thing to read Thucydides merely for a knowledge of the events of Greek history, and another thing to learn from his narrative the motives of human conduct, the influence of the characters of men on the circumstances of the world, and, reciprocally, of those circumstances on the characters of men. You may read of the Sedition of Corcyra, or the conduct of the Sicilian Expedition, with the interest merely of the reader of a romance,

* Second edition, Lecture ii. pp. 42–48.
† Ibid., Lecture ii. p. 70.

or the curiosity of the antiquarian, or the taste of the philologist and the critic. But what a charm may be thrown over the study, when you read in these masterly sketches the history of man as a moral being, whilst you trace in them the developments of that moral nature which you feel in yourselves, and sympathise with its varied manifestations in the events brought before your eye! So, in Homer—rich as the intellectual feast is which, in the profusion of his poetic inspiration, he spreads before you, —the chief delight, I am persuaded, which results from the reading of him, is from that profound knowledge of the human heart which he reveals in every line, and which imparts to his writings so exquisite a pathos, beyond, perhaps, every other human composition. Let Homer be read with an eye directed to this point of view; learn to look at human nature as he beheld it, by meditating on his thoughts; and you may be sure you are on that track which will lead, if pursued, to the "serene temples" of moral science.' *

It is impossible for the editor of these pages to give any worthy account of the contents of this volume of lectures. The few short extracts made from them are placed here to give some general idea of the author's plan for the instruction of his pupils as Professor of Moral Philosophy.

About this time an inquiry was made of him, through a friend, whether he would accept one of the smaller English Bishoprics. † The following is an extract from his reply:—

Dr. Hampden to a friend.

St. Mary Hall: October 20, 1835.

It would be untrue to say that the event of such an offer as that referred to in your letter would not be a considerable

* Second edition, Lecture vii. p. 267.

† At that time there was a much greater inequality among English Bishoprics than at present.

temptation to me. Perhaps I could not sufficiently know myself at the moment to realise the conscientiousness of the motives by which I should believe myself to be actuated. At the same time, I should observe, I have never felt pecuniary considerations operate as principal inducements with me in any pursuit. Certainly it would be a very high gratification to me to reach the highest order of the profession to which I belong. To an ambition of this kind I must plead guilty, so far perhaps, that I might comparatively overlook the value of a particular preferment, and be tempted to accept it *imprudently*, as it might be said, in the worldly sense of the term. But I only mention this that you may see where my weak point lies, when I say Yes to the question you have asked. I feel, that is, that I am not quite free from bias in attempting to answer it. I have, however, a deep conviction of the arduousness and responsibility of the task which the acceptance of such an offer would impose. And should it please God ever to call me to so high a station in His Church, as I should not enter on it without an earnest self-devotion, so I should rely on His assistance to support me under its difficulties, and to enable me to carry into effect my sincere feeling that I would not shrink from them through fear or indolence, or other unworthy principle.

I have already, I hope I may say without arrogance, experienced in some degree how charitable views and conduct in the maintenance of one's convictions smooth the way amidst opposition—at least, what advantage they give to the advocate by keeping him in the proper temper for defence, and the satisfaction resulting from them that nothing has been done, at all events, that can vitally wound the cause of truth. The same line of conduct it would be my anxious study to pursue in any larger sphere of duty. As to my competence generally for so important a post, one for which in these times few are equal, while it does not belong to me to judge of that, it would be pusillanimous to withdraw myself from the trial by an act of self-condemnation. I do not feel that I am incapable of improving myself in the qualifications required, and I am sanguine enough to hope that the necessity of the duty will call forth the requisite power for its performance.

The subject of University tests, which had occasioned his pamphlet on Religious Dissent, still occupied his mind. The following letter to Mr. Nassau Senior gives evidence of his earnestness in this matter:—

Dr. Hampden to Mr. Nassau Senior.

St. Mary Hall: Jan. 24, 1836.

Accept my best thanks for your kindness in sending me a copy of your article on political economy. I can return you my thanks the more readily, as I am already in great measure aware of the value of the instruction contained in it, having read at least the substance of part of it in some of your detached publications. I trust we are daily advancing towards a more practical recognition of the great principle which you enforce, of leaving the course of nature as much as possible to its own free action, instead of encumbering and impeding it by officious regulations. For my part, I have always been opposed to the system of exclusion. Neither the cause of truth, nor the well-being of a country, I am convinced, has ever been effectually promoted by such a method of legislation. And I am happy to think that we have now a Government which appears to be sincerely at work against the sinister influences of former undue interference, and which I trust will be able to carry into effect its just and wise policy, so as to preclude altogether a recurrence to the narrow maxims of other days.

I look indeed with earnest hope to what may yet be accomplished by following out your principle, even in this stronghold of prejudice. I have exerted my humble means to bring about a reformation of our practice here in regard to tests. But the very small minority in which I am at present gives little, indeed no expectation, that anything will be done by the University itself. We are about to take the oaths into consideration in the course of this term, with what result remains to be seen. With regard, however, to any step towards the admission of Dissenters, the case, as I have said, seems to be hopeless on the part of the University. The Duke of Wellington, indeed, has more than once recommended to the Board of Heads of Houses to consider in what way the present subscription test at matriculation may be modified or altered;

suggesting that either it should be explained as to its force and intention, or the period at which it is required be postponed. But his recommendation has met with no favourable reception by the Board. The former of these two methods would be the most palatable to the majority here, because it would enable them to retain the present practice with a statutable palliation of it; but in my view is the most decidedly objectionable, as it would be only canonizing, in the form of a statute, a quibble devised in the moment of need in defence of a practice in itself indefensible. Such an expedient might probably pass the Convocation. But the fanatical spirit with which even the very moderate 'declaration' of last Easter was met in the Convocation, sufficiently shows what would be the fate of any proposal for removing the subscription altogether from the matriculation, even if such a measure could be carried at the Board of Heads. What, however, can be expected, when the very advice of our Chancellor has been rejected? It remains that we must receive the boon (as I truly consider it), from other hands; and even then great care must be taken that it be not frustrated by statutes subsequently framed for the purpose of counteraction.

CHAPTER V.

1836.

REGIUS PROFESSORSHIP OF DIVINITY OFFERED BY LORD MELBOURNE—COMMOTION AT OXFORD—REMARKS OF ARCHBISHOP WHATELY—HIS ACCOUNT OF THE PROCEEDINGS—LETTER FROM DR. HAMPDEN TO ARCHBISHOP WHATELY—TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY—LETTER OF BISHOP COPLESTON—DR. HAMPDEN'S ATTITUDE—LETTERS FROM LORD MELBOURNE—FURTHER LETTER FROM DR. HAMPDEN TO ARCHBISHOP WHATELY.

In the beginning of the year 1836 the Regius Professorship of Divinity became vacant by the death of Dr. Burton. The appointment was offered by Lord Melbourne to Dr. Hampden in the following terms: 'The reputation which you enjoy of various and extended general information, as well as of profound theological knowledge, and also of a liberal spirit of inquiry tempered by due caution, joined to the accounts which I have received from those in whose judgment I place the greatest confidence, induce me to offer to recommend you to His Majesty as a person well qualified to fill the Professorship of Divinity now vacant by the death of Dr. Burton.'

On the first rumour of the appointment an agitation against it was set on foot, organised and conducted by a section of the extreme High Church party, known as the 'Tract party,' on account of the leaders of that party having conjointly put forward their views in the well-known 'Tracts for the Times.' It is true this party had reason to fear the teaching of Dr. Hampden, for it struck at the root of their own. He taught the supremacy of the Scriptures: they, what in their peculiar phraseology,

they termed 'the Church' and 'tradition.' * Besides this, his teaching had been highly esteemed by the University; he had been entrusted with the most prominent offices by the Chancellor and the leading members of the University. The Tract party were joined on this occasion by a certain number of the 'high and dry' Tories, who opposed Dr. Hampden as the nominee of a Liberal Government; and to these were added some members of the Low Church party. He was in no sense a party man, and therefore had no 'party' support.

'To be furious, is to be frighted out of fear.'† The violence, the bitterness, the extreme rudeness of the opposition can only be gathered from the showers of pamphlets put forth in attack, and from the newspapers and reviews that lent them support. There were 'strictures,' 'statements' of all sorts, 'elucidations,' 'narratives,' &c. &c. But the absence in these publications of anything resembling argument or discussion is remarkable. But this was not all. Certain members of the University formed themselves into a 'committee,' and

* At the conclusion of a lecture on 'Tradition,' which the Professor read before the University, he says:

'Let tradition be once established, whether doctrinal or interpretative as a rule of faith; and it will be sure in the event to supersede the written authority, or make it of none effect. The unwritten doctrine will ultimately assume the air of greater sanctity. As compared with the written, it will appear like the moral or natural law, compared with the positive; the very indefiniteness of its origin investing it with a mysterious obligation. The sentiment which the poet puts into the mouth of Antigone—

Οὐδὲ σθένειν τοσοῦτον ᾠόμην τὰ σὰ
Κηρύγμαθ', ὥστ' ἄγραπτα κἀσφαλῆ θεῶν
Νόμιμα δύνασθαι θνητὸν ὄνθ' ὑπερδραμεῖν·
Οὐ γάρ τι νῦν γε κἀχθὲς, ἀλλ' ἀεί ποτε
Ζῇ ταῦτα, κοὐδεὶς οἶδεν ἐξ ὅτου 'φάνη·

is only the natural sentiment with which traditionary doctrines, coming down with the mist of early years around them, are regarded. It is scarcely to be wondered at therefore, strange as it may seem to us looking at the bare fact in itself, that the Jews should have "made the word of God of none effect by their traditions." '—(Fifth edition, p. 75.)

† *Antony and Cleopatra*, act iii. scene xi.

assembled in the rooms of a member of Corpus Christi College. The head of the college took no part in the proceedings. This 'committee' issued a number of placards in large advertising type. Between February 24 and March 10, no less than eight of these placards were published; and two of them appeared in a single day. Dr. Hampden was allowed no breathing time. Even had he thought it needful to reply to his accusers, it would have been impossible. He stood alone, the object of their joint attack. Not that the generous sympathy of high-minded men—even of many who differed from him—was wanting; for the very violence of the onslaught aroused indignation against so ungenerous, so unreasoning, so personal an opposition.

In the 'Life of Archbishop Whately' the following passage occurs. Speaking of Dr. Dickinson, afterwards Bishop of Kildare, Dr. Whately says:

'He perceived, with me, that the Hampden persecution was the first outbreak of Tractism, and its success the great strengthener of the party. The combustibles were ready indeed, and some other spark, if not that, would have kindled them; but the support the party received at the time of that persecution, from those who did not really belong to them, but opposed Hampden from political or other motives, gave them a great lift. In Hampden's case, it must be owned I did not anticipate any outbreak so monstrous as did ensue, and, what is more, if I had remained head of Alban Hall it would never have taken place. This is quite certain, for my successor was one of the most violent of the persecutors, and the measure passed the Board of Heads by *one* vote. But most of my Oxford friends have assured me that the thing would not have even been attempted; that those disposed to it would have shrunk from encountering the exposure they would have had to expect at the Hebdomadal Board; and that those who were led away

would have found the better suggestions of their minds fortified. . . . There have been, perhaps, other persecutions as unjust and as cruel (none *more* so if we take into account the times and circumstances of each; for burning of heretics is unsuited to the present age, and moreover was not in the power of the Hampden persecutors; they did all that they could and dared, and so did Bonner), but for impudence I never knew the like. To find out, three years after the Bampton Lectures had been delivered, and two years after they had been published, that they were dangerously heterodox, though they had passed at the time not only unanswered, but with high applause! There never was a more lame and palpably false pretence so shamefully brought forward. I used often to remark, while it was going on, that the instances continually displayed in it of combined folly, cruelty, and baseness were startling even to one who, like me, had not anticipated much greatness or goodness from human nature. But there is no telling, when a pond seems clear, how much mud there may be at the bottom till you stir it up.' *

Some more particular account of the proceedings at Oxford at this time may be found in the same author's 'Reminiscences' of Bishop Copleston: 'As soon as the appointment was announced, an outbreak ensued, to which the history of this country can hardly furnish a parallel. A number of persons (several of whom have since joined the Church of Rome), professing emphatically "Church-principles" assembled in a kind of self-constituted synod, and denounced a brother-minister of their own church as heretical; and ultimately induced the Oxford Convocation to pass a vote which there is strong reason to believe was utterly illegal, though the apprehension of ruinous expenses prevented the question being brought to trial. Their charge was directed against Dr. Hampden's

* *Life of Archbishop Whately*, new edition (1868), p. 133.

Bampton Lectures, which had been delivered three years before—which had been two years published—which had obtained very high and general approbation, and against which no specific charge had ever been brought (nor has been to this day) before either the Bishop of the Diocese or the University-authorities expressly appointed to take cognisance of such complaints. Moreover, he had in the interval been appointed to the Headship of Mary Hall by the Chancellor, without the least hint of an objection, and had been elected Professor of Moral Philosophy, an office which is in the appointment of certain functionaries in the University, of whom several, two years after, took the lead in the censures passed on the very publication for which they had themselves applauded and rewarded him!'*

The 'self-constituted synod' importuned the Board of Heads of Houses to take proceedings against Dr. Hampden with restless energy. The Board rejected the plans proposed to them, and immediately others were substituted, that seemed more likely to be entertained. The following letter gives an account of the proceedings at the Board of Heads:—

Dr. Hampden to Archbishop Whately.

St. Mary Hall: February 17, 1836.

The papers have probably given you some intimation of the war which has been proceeding here during the last few days; but I long to send you a statement from myself of the persecution I have undergone. It has been truly nothing less than persecution—they have only not been able to light the faggots. No sooner was my name connected with the appointment to the Divinity Chair, than the most active and violent measures were taken here to prevent my appointment. Not only were private letters written up to Lord Melbourne on the subject, but a meeting was held in Corpus at Mr. ——'s rooms, at which

* *Remains of Bishop Copleston* (Introduction: *Reminiscences* by Archbishop Whately), p. 56.

it was determined to draw up a memorial to the King, or Archbishop of Canterbury—I am not certain which, but at any rate to be passed through the Archbishop's hands—against me. You will easily judge who the parties were that were the principal movers in the business, and how their number would be swollen in the present diseased state both of religious and political feeling in the University. They obtained, I believe, about seventy names to their list, and the paper accordingly has been transmitted to the Archbishop. But this is not all. I am sure you will be indignant to hear that immediately after this proceeding, the Board of Heads of Houses was summoned to back the outrage by converting itself into a Court of Inquisition. At a special meeting on Thursday last, it was the subject of deliberation whether any step should be taken by the Board in consequence of the rumour that it was the intention of Ministers to place me in the Divinity Chair. Numbers were canvassed beforehand in order to get a majority for the hostile measure designed, and they tried, out of mock kindness, to prevent my attendance. I did attend, however, to confront their folly and intolerance, and with the kind and skilful support of the Provost of Oriel succeeded in disappointing their attempt.

But for the seriousness of the occasion and the malignant feeling in which it evidently originated, you would have smiled at —— producing passages from my 'Bampton Lectures' as evidences of my heterodoxy, and —— and —— murmuring their approbation of their leader. But really the matter is too serious to be passed over without further notice. I need not inform you, I dare say, that all this violence has in the event failed in its direct object, that it has not prevented the appointment, but that the opinion of wiser heads and hearts have prevailed to frustrate the malice with which I have been assailed.

The outline of the history of this struggle will be best understood from letters written at the time,* or from the accounts of eye-witnesses.

On February 27, Dr. Hampden addressed the Arch-

* No letters are quoted or referred to which have not been seen in the original by the Editor.

bishop of Canterbury (Dr. Howley) in the following letter.

Dr. Hampden to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

My Lord Archbishop,—Having seen for the first time in the public papers of yesterday a Memorial to His Majesty from certain members of the University of Oxford sent to your grace, I beg leave most respectfully to address myself to your grace on the subject.

I trust I shall be fully believed when I affirm, as I do in the most solemn manner, that I have no thought, in anything I have said or written on theological subjects, but to uphold, to the best of my ability, the doctrines and established formularies of the Church of England. My 'Bampton Lectures' are simply a history of the technical terms of theology; nor have they the slightest tendency, in my view and intention, to impugn the vital truths of Christianity. My pamphlet entitled 'Observations on Religious Dissent' had no other design but to induce a charitable construction of the views of those who differ from us. Nothing could have been more painfully shocking to my feelings than the connection of my name with the opinions which I detest. I may be indulged on this occasion with saying, that a belief in the great revealed truths of the Trinity and the Incarnation has been my stay through life; and I utterly disclaim the imputation of inculcating any doctrines at variance with these foundations of Christian hope.

I do not pretend, my lord, always to have stated my views with the precision and clearness that I would have wished; nor do I venture to assert that I have avoided all mistakes in what I have said, or that I have always taken the best method of teaching the truth.

What I wish to impress on your grace is, that I have studied to declare it; and in doing so, to maintain the Articles of the Church. As some evidence of this I would refer to my volume of Parochial Sermons, which has never been attacked. I have written, therefore, humbly to request that your grace will give me a hearing, if there be anything alleged against me which appears to demand an explanation on my part.

May I be allowed also to say, that in undertaking the responsible office of Regius Professor of Divinity, my heartfelt

desire is to acquit myself faithfully of my duty as a member of the Church of Christ, to whom a high trust has been committed; and to take peculiar care never to do or say what may injure the sacred cause to which I have devoted myself. I would further earnestly embrace this opportunity of stating that I am most ready, as in duty bound, to receive any admonition from your grace as to the most effectual mode of discharging the office.

I feel confident that the Bishop of Llandaff, who has long known me, will bear testimony to the sincerity with which I express these sentiments.

I have the honour to remain, my lord, with the greatest respect, your grace's humble servant,

R. D. HAMPDEN.

As this letter refers to the Bishop of Llandaff (Copleston), it is satisfactory to find how warmly he responded to the feeling expressed towards him. He says: 'I have just seen in the "Times" your letter to the Archbishop, in which you speak of me as you had a full right to speak —namely, as one who would vouch for your sincerity. I not only can vouch for your sincerity, but I admire the Christian temper with which you have borne unmerited persecution . . . . You will, I hope, not succumb under this persecution, but continue, as you have hitherto done, calmly to assert your rights, to perform your appointed duties, and to leave the whole blame with those who obstruct and revile you.'

When the unexpected uproar was at its height, Dr. Hampden wrote to Lord Melbourne expressing his readiness to withdraw from the appointment, if the Government felt themselves in any way embarrassed by the course matters had taken. But the Prime Minister had not recommended him to the King without due consideration, and being fully determined to stand by the man he considered the best fitted for the office, replied as follows: 'In justice to ourselves and you, for the sake of the principles of toleration and free inquiry, we consider our-

selves bound to persevere in your appointment to the Regius Professorship of Divinity, which has been approved by His Majesty.' Again, Lord Melbourne says, 'I feel deeply for the painful conflict in which you are engaged.' And to a common friend he wrote: 'Dr. Hampden himself behaved most generously and disinterestedly. I have expressed as much to him, but I shall be obliged to you if you would let him know that I am deeply impressed with this opinion.'

Though at the time of the appointment he was unacquainted with Lord Melbourne, subsequently he had many opportunities of conversing with him. Like all who came in contact with him, Dr. Hampden was charmed by the natural grace of his manner, and was also struck by the great readiness and real interest with which he would enter into theological questions, and astonished to find the extent of his theological reading and study. On one occasion Lord Melbourne wrote that he had heard that certain tracts had 'lately been published anonymously at Oxford upon religious subjects, of a very novel character, and generally attributed to those who had been "very active" upon the occasion of the opposition' to Dr. Hampden, and added: 'Not knowing the title of these tracts, I am at a loss how to direct a bookseller to procure them;' concluding the letter with a request that the tracts might be sent to him. Once, while conversing with Dr. Hampden, he perceived how deeply his feelings had been wounded by the treatment he had received at Oxford, and laying a kindly hand on his arm said: 'Be easy; I like an easy man.'

An extract from a letter of Dr. Hampden's to Archbishop Whately expresses how much he suffered at this time:—

Dr. Hampden to Archbishop Whately.

St. Mary Hall: March 2, 1836.

I am almost borne down by the weight and fury of the opposition brought against me here. However, I thank God, my resolution has not failed me yet; and I trust that, armed in the justice of my cause, I shall at length be carried successfully through the struggle. Meanwhile the effort is most painful, and strongly tasks my nerves. I have received this morning a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury, in answer to one I addressed to him on the subject. I shall try and send it to you with a copy of mine. It clearly appears from it that the Archbishop had already taken his side; not having deigned even to ask me a question on the subject beforehand; and I find that I am to expect no sympathy, or even fair hearing, from that quarter. But the document will speak abundantly for itself.

You will probably have heard of the two votes of censure, proposed by 'the party' here to be brought into Convocation, having been thrown out by the Board of Heads on Monday last. They are now meditating some new scheme. As far as I can learn, they mean to press their measures again on the board. I have given notice of an inaugural lecture, which I propose reading in the Divinity School on Thursday the 17th. I mean to make it as simple a statement as possible of my orthodoxy of belief, abstaining from all controversy, and to print it with an appendix, clearing up some misrepresentations and answering objections.

The composition of this Inaugural Lecture was no easy task. Mrs. Hampden said at this time her husband lost both sleep and appetite, his chief nourishment being what her anxious care would place by his side as he wrote. He was constantly called from his work to read notices of meetings summoned to oppose him; to talk with friends who came to tell him the 'reports' of petitions to the King, to the archbishops, to the council of the University. He was inundated by letters—many from strangers—kind and good, with words of comfort and encouragement:

some from those he had considered as friends, who wrote as a sort of salve to their conscience, to inform him they had suddenly become hostile. He could not walk down the High Street without passing many whom he had been accustomed to greet in a friendly manner, who, without one note of warning, had set themselves to act against him to the utmost of their ability. The very notoriety that was thus forced upon him was painful to one of his sensitive disposition. An outspoken friend said to him, 'Abuse you? of course they will, if you are worth abusing!' adding with quiet humour, 'I wish they would abuse me.' Another dear old friend wrote to him: 'They have tried to blow you out; but have only made you blaze.'

CHAPTER VI.

INAUGURAL LECTURE AS REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY—DESCRIPTION IN 'EDINBURGH REVIEW,' BY DR. ARNOLD—LETTER FROM THE SAME—LETTER FROM DR. HAMPDEN TO EDITOR OF 'EDINBURGH REVIEW'—ATTEMPT TO EXCLUDE HIM FROM THE ELECTION OF SELECT PREACHERS—ACCOUNT OF THE PROCEEDINGS, BY MR. NASSAU SENIOR—LETTER OF THE REV. E. ROWLANDSON—LETTER FROM DR. HAMPDEN TO ARCHBISHOP WHATELY.

THE following account of the delivery of the Inaugural Lecture is taken from an article in the 'Edinburgh Review,' entitled 'The Oxford Malignants and Dr. Hampden:' it was written by Dr. Arnold. To those most nearly interested for Dr. Hampden, it is a high gratification to record the testimony borne in his favour by so great, so true-hearted a man. After a description of the previous factious proceedings at Oxford the writer goes on to say:—

'In the midst of all this ferment, the day arrived on which Dr. Hampden was to deliver his inaugural lecture. As might have been expected, an immense crowd of hearers attended it. It was a trying moment; for as the Professor looked round upon his audience, he saw the well-known faces of his persecutors, who had already shown abundantly that they were of those who make a man an offender for a word, and who were come to his lecture not to be convinced, not to be softened, not to listen and to judge with fairness and truth; but to lay hold upon every expression, to misunderstand or misrepresent his matter, and to pervert his tone and manner; —ready to call conciliation cowardice, and firmness pride. Yet from this fiery ordeal Dr. Hampden came

forth nobly triumphant. It was touching to observe the subdued emotion of his countenance, and the unquelled and unexcited dignity of his voice:—it was beautiful to mark how he had triumphed over opposite temptations,—how meekly and patiently he laboured to remove misunderstanding,—how honestly he abstained from one word of unworthy compromise,—yet how heroically he forbore from every expression of resentment or contempt towards the faction of his unworthy calumniators. We cannot resist the pleasure of copying the concluding passage of this most Christian address:—

'"I appeal from an excited spirit to a spirit of soberness and candour; I demand not to be tried by the conclusions of an adverse school, but by the calm and gentle reason of men disposed to give me credit for no less love of the truth and the faith than themselves, and who will openly contend with me by argument, not by censure and intimidation, and the array of hostile numbers: 'Non tam bene cum rebus humanis agitur,' says an ancient philosopher, 'ut meliora pluribus placeant; argumentum pessimi, turba est.' And a far greater than the philosopher has said:—'Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you.'—'Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake.'—'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me.' These words are my comfort; I trust He who spoke them will enable me to proceed on my way without repining at the suffering through which He has required that I should pass; and without relaxation of spirit in His work under the painfulness of the counteraction against which it must be done. I am at all times ready to meet fair and free discussion, but to misrepresentation, and clamour, and violence, with God's help I will never yield. I pray God to forgive those who may have employed such weapons against me,

and to turn their hearts, and to grant them more of that mind which was in Christ Jesus.

'"It is a great grief to me, I acknowledge, to know that there are any whose honest though mistaken zeal I may have offended. Such are, I trust, open to conviction and kinder feelings; I should, however, unless experience had furnished ample instances of it, wonder that Christian zeal should in any individual have carried him to proceedings destructive of Christian purity and peace. A sense of Christian duty and the kind feelings of the heart will never, I believe, be found apart from each other, and least of all, in doing 'the work of the Lord.'

'"After all, however, I appear not here as a functionary of the University, or of the Church alone, but as the servant of a Master in Heaven by whose judgment I must stand or fall. For let me say it with that humility which becomes me in applying to myself such sacred words: 'With me it is a small thing that I should be judged of you or of man's judgment; yea, I judge not mine own self. For I know nothing by myself; yet am I not hereby justified: but he that judgeth me is the Lord. Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall every man have praise of God.'"

'This might have been thought irresistible; but faction and fanaticism combined are proof against any impression of truth or goodness. The conspirators actually adjourned their meetings from Corpus common room to Mr. Baxter's printing office; there, with the press before them, they issued with unabated zeal their placards, and circulars, and elucidations, and statements,—all designed to fanaticise their partisans amongst the country clergy, whom they had summoned up to Oxford to secure their expected triumph in the Convocation on the 22nd of March.'*

* *Edinburgh Review* for April 1836, p. 231.

In an unpublished letter from the same author to Dr. Hampden, there occurs the following passage, which, as it relates immediately to this part of the history of the struggle, may find a place here, though the letter is dated February 17, and must consequently have been written before the article already quoted.

Dr. Arnold to Dr. Hampden.

One man may agree with you, another may differ from you; for myself I think I differ from your views as to the distinct character of religion and morality, while with what you say of the evils of a technical and theoretical theology, I agree most fully. I understand you to mean what I have often advanced and taught myself, orally and in writing, that the Scripture is to be used for lessons more than for truths, that morally and as far as our own feelings and conduct are concerned, we may make deductions from Scripture with perfect safety, but that an abstract deduction drawn from language, which, when speaking of the Divine Being, must be the language of accommodation, is generally unwarranted, and must be often absurd. This I hold to be so true that the contrary system has been the worst corruption of Christianity, next to the system of priestcraft, which the world has ever seen; it has turned away our eyes from the bread of life, while it has beguiled us with a stone.

These are times when good men ought not to be silent, and let folly and malice and dishonesty have everything their own way. It was an evil hour which took Whately from Oxford, where he was doing great and certain good, to exhaust his powers in what is but an attempt to raise corn out of the sea sand. If there be anything in which I can be of service to you on the present occasion, I should not say to you personally, but to the cause of Truth and Honesty which has been attacked in you, I should rejoice to co-operate.

The 'Edinburgh Review,' containing the article on 'The Oxford Malignants,' was sent by the Editor, Mr. Macvey Napier, to the Professor, and with it a letter expressing much kind and generous feeling and sympathy

towards him. The following reply was sent by Dr. Hampden to Mr. Macvey Napier.

Oxford: April 21, 1836.

Dear Sir,—Accept my grateful acknowledgments for your kind favour in sending me a copy of the article in the 'Edinburgh Review.' An expression of sympathy is peculiarly valuable on such a trying occasion as the present, as, though, providentially, I have been sustained under it by a firm and clear consciousness of the integrity of my cause, it has yet been hard to bear up against the extreme pressure; and I have derived much comfort and encouragement from learning that there are candid spirits elsewhere, as well as here, interested in my support and vindication. Amongst these it is peculiarly gratifying to me to be able to number yourself; and I am at the same much flattered by the literary recollection with which you have connected your present kindness.

Here, indeed, the persecution has amounted to a mania. But I trust good will come of it in the end, mischievous as it is just now. The public attention will now be fully drawn to the state of this University, and a searching inquiry, I anxiously hope, will be made into the causes of this violent outbreak of fanaticism, and that it will lead to a great reform and purification of our system. I have long seen the tendency of all that has been going on here to degrade the University from its proper station and real usefulness as an university, to the rank of a low theological school. The present fury is but a strong manifestation of this.

The article itself is certainly admirably done, and will contribute much, I have no doubt, to disabuse the public mind, and call forth the merited indignation against the authors of such outrageous proceedings. I shall care little for the censure of my Oxford persecutors and their ignorant partisans, if only their conduct can be fully brought to light, and the verdict of general opinion can be taken on their case.

With respect, I remain, &c.,

R. D. HAMPDEN.

A certain statute proposed to Convocation on March 22, 1836, was framed so as to exclude the Regius Professor from

his place (amongst many others) at a board whose duty it is to appoint 'Select Preachers' in the University. As far as its actual importance went, that was ridiculously small; but, as an evidence of party-feeling, as a key-note for clamour, it answered the desires of the framers. The Margaret Professor of Divinity was substituted for the Queen's. The statute was to the following effect: 'Seeing that it is committed by the University to the Regius Professor of Divinity, that he should be one of the number of those by whom the Select Preachers are designated, according to Tit. xvi. § 8; and also that his counsel should be given if any Preacher should be called in question before the Vice-Chancellor, according to Tit. xvi. § 11; and since the present Professor hath in his published writings so treated matters theological, that in this respect the University hath no confidence in him: it is decreed that the Regius Professor of Divinity shall be deprived of the aforesaid offices, until it shall otherwise please the University; but lest the University should in the meantime suffer any loss, others shall execute the offices of the said Professor—to wit, in choosing the Select Preachers, the senior among the Deputies of the Vice-Chancellor, or in his absence, or in the case of his holding the place of Vice-Chancellor himself, then the next Deputy in order (provided always he shall have taken holy orders); and in the holding any council concerning sermons, the Lady Margaret's Professor.' The legal 'Opinion' on this statute, which was afterwards procured by Dr. Hampden, was in the following terms:—

We think the statute of 1836 is illegal, as violating the restrictions imposed by the Laudian Code, and as passed by the assumption and exercise of a power which has not been conceded to the University.

(Signed) J. CAMPBELL.
STEPHEN LUSHINGTON.
WILLIAM WINSTANLEY HULL.

Temple, December 17, 1836.

A letter written by the late Mr. Nassau Senior, which appeared in the 'Globe' newspaper of March 23, gives, though in an off-hand way, a most exact account of what occurred in Convocation on the previous day :—

Oxford to-day has exhibited the appearance of a Spanish town at an *auto-da-fè*, with this difference, that the visitors who crowded to it from the rural districts came in the hopes not only of enjoying the triumph of Holy Church over a heretic, but of actually contributing to his sufferings. Early in the course of yesterday the inns began to be filled with comfortable-looking gentlemen in white neckcloths and black gaiters, and countenances in which a general depression—arising from the deplorable state of the Church under a reforming Commission, and of the State under a reforming Government—was somewhat enlivened by the hope of inflicting in the meantime some vengeance on Lord Melbourne's appointee. You are aware that this day was appointed to consider the new statute, in the strictest sense of that hateful word, a privilegium, by which, in language as barbarous as its object, in the Latinity as well as in the spirit of the fourteenth century, the University was to have suspended Dr. Hampden from the function, by statute annexed to his office, of voting on the appointment of Select Preachers, 'quum nullam ejus fiduciam habeat Universitas.'

Long before two o'clock, the hour appointed for holding the Congregation, the neighbourhood of the Convocation House was filled by Masters so numerous that it became necessary to change the place of meeting to the theatre. . . . The Vice-Chancellor directed the proposed new statute to be read, and in the accustomed words, 'Ecquis sententiam vulgo proferre vult?' invited on it such discussion as the use of Latin will, in these degenerate days, allow. Up then rose Mr. Vaughan Thomas, and after pronouncing without book the *solemnia verba*, 'Insignissime Vice-Cancellarie, vosque Egregii Procuratores,' proceeded to read from the crown of his cap the only speech which was destined to enliven the discussion. In good 'middle ages Latin,' and with a voice which Stentor might have envied, he called upon us (it is not easy to see why) not to argue but to act—to give to the cause of religion not words, but deeds. The question, he vociferated (not very consistently), is not about the supports but

the foundations of religion, a cause in which all who are silent are traitors. Applying himself, then, to the prevailing subject of apprehension, the interposition of the Procuratorial veto, he first expressed, as is the custom of all great orators, his conviction that the veto would not be exercised. He could not believe that in the general danger, when religion was all but overthrown, the Proctors would help on the work of destruction. He then implored them, even if they *had* decided, to take pity on the University, to consult the general tranquillity, and, instead of introducing or perpetuating dissension, to yield to the opinion of the great majority. . . . . .
Much clapping followed the conclusion of this speech, which, for a Latin speech—a speech in which a man says not what he wishes, but what the idioms of the language, or his own mastery of it, will permit—was really a very creditable performance, as far as language and voice were concerned. To be sure the beginning of it sounded, to those accustomed to London politics, rather absurd; but it was not a bit the worse as regards sense, or rather the want of it, than half the conversation of this place.

Discussion was again invited by the Vice-Chancellor, and all that followed was the following speech, from an orator whose name I could not catch, and whose fame, therefore, must, as far as it depends on me, perish:—'Mr. Vice-Chancellor, I trust that we shall have no modern Liberalism or Whiggery here, and that'—here the orator was stopped by the Vice-Chancellor's remark, that nothing but Latin must be used in the venerable House of Congregation. The proposed statute was again read, and discussion was again invited, but no one answered; and the Vice-Chancellor began to put the question. 'Placetne vobis, Domini Doctores?' he asked; and the answer of the majority was, 'Placet.' He then said the more important words, 'Placetne vobis, Magistri?' Whereupon rose the two Proctors and uttered, or seemed to utter (for the noise was too great for them to be heard), words which have been unknown in the Congregation House for centuries—'Nobis Procuratoribus non placet.' Instantly there arose shouts, screams, and groans, from the galleries and the area, such as no deliberative assembly probably ever heard before; in the midst of which the Vice-Chancellor, without dissolving the assembly, without even uttering

a word, put on his cap, and with no very dignified haste, proceeded, with a tail of Doctors, to evacuate the theatre. The galleries clapped and hissed as they passed; and in about ten minutes the whole scene of battle was empty. And so has ended the matter for the present.

> Hĭ motus animorum, atque hæc certamina tanta
> Pulveris exigui jactu compôsta quiescunt.

A letter published in the 'Times' of March 30, 1836, from the Rev. E. Rowlandson, formerly Fellow of Queen's College, and Rector of North Bradley, gives an account of the impression left on the mind of a clergyman of well-known high character by the proceedings in the Convocation. At the head of his letter he puts the poet Cowper's line—

> Nor judge by statute a believer's hope.

I am (says the writer) the eldest son of, I believe, the only tutor Dr. Hampden ever had previously to his entering the University, but who died some years since. He left, however, in his family more than one heart warmly alive to the fact, more than one mouth ready at all times to testify it, that by young Hampden's exemplary and, humanly speaking, perfect purity of morals, by his affectionate heart and amiable deportment, by his rare and extraordinary gratitude, proved from the first day to the last by solid facts, and, lastly and principally, by his fervent and holy, though chaste and retiring piety (in proof of which I could adduce affecting traits); he conciliated the warmest love and most unbounded esteem of both my parents, and left on their minds an impression of profound veneration for his character. This man I am now required to vote unfit to teach true religion—that is, to pronounce a disgrace to the University of which he is the brightest ornament, and to the Church of which he is a sound and faithful member. I am required to believe that one who was holy and exemplary as a youth, and has ever been so as a clergyman, and in all the relations of life, is, notwithstanding, a perverter of truth, a teacher of scepticism, and a propagator of unbelief. He acknowledges in his inaugural lecture that he may sometimes have expressed

himself in a manner liable to mistake, and he has in that lecture, so far as its very limited compass would allow, taken all pains to correct it. But if these are sufficient grounds for censure and degradation, surely it will apply to many more of our most valuable divines, nay even to the inspired apostle, who wrote 'many things hard to be understood, and which they that are unstable and unlearned,' or, I may add, uncandid or indolent, 'do wrest' and pervert from their general and main drift, from their true and just meaning. I assert, and could unanswerably prove, that many of the younger clergy — some of whom had been recently indebted to Dr. H., as an examiner, for a certificate of competent attainments for a degree, and who were brought up to judge him by means hasty, indecent, unfair, and in their consequences irreparably pernicious, were in my own knowledge both 'unstable and unlearned;' and I humbly ask whether the boisterous violence betrayed on Tuesday last in the theatre by an assemblage of clergymen, in the act of passing what ought to be, to them at least, a painful censure upon a Christian of acknowledged amiableness of character, was not a sufficient evidence that such weighty and momentous causes ought not to come for decision before such youthful and inexperienced minds, which, on first entering the Church, are usually swollen with the pride of exclusive orthodoxy, are full of texts, articles, and arguments, and fierce in defence of their tenets against all assailants, actual or fancied.

In conclusion, I would humbly ask the older, more grave, more decent, more pure-minded of those who on that day were, doubtless painfully to their own feelings, mixed up with the frantic throng, whether they in their consciences thought that the true religion, the practical piety, the charity, the spiritual interests of these teachers of 'peace on earth,' and, through them, of the community, were likely to be promoted by that day's support, as they believed it, of orthodoxy?

On the subject of the Convocation of March 22, the following extract from a letter to Archbishop Whately gives Dr. Hampden's own account of it:—

Dr. Hampden to Archbishop Whately.

April 7, 1836.

I have been anxious to write to you for some days past, but my mind has really been so much engaged, that I have scarcely known what to turn to first. In the meantime, you have not, of course, been ignorant of what has been doing here; you will have heard of that previous Convocation of the 22nd, of the intercession of the Proctors, and the political proceedings in Brasenose Hall afterwards, under the management of —— and ——, and others of the same party. The noble conduct of the Proctors on the occasion has attracted to them some of the violence which was before directed against me singly. A threat, indeed, has been made to the junior Proctor (Reynolds of Jesus College) that his Divinity degree will be stopped. Still the storm has not been warded off me. I am told I may expect it to be renewed with increased fury in a few days. One of the zealots has said, I hear, that he would rather die than let it drop. Such, then, is the present state of the prosecution. It is only a deceitful calm just at present, and unless there is more prudence and right feeling in the Board of Heads than have hitherto appeared at that board, the scenes of last term have only passed to be reacted in the next. I thank you most cordially for the suggestions you have so kindly given me, and the timely support and encouragement which I have received from the expression of your sympathy. But what is to be done, after all, against such opponents—men to whose reason or feelings you can make no appeal?

CHAPTER VII.

DR. HAMPDEN AT THE OUTBREAK OF THE AGITATION ON HIS APPOINTMENT AS REGIUS PROFESSOR—HIS COMMENTS ON THE TREATMENT OF HIS WRITINGS — LETTER TO BISHOP PHILLPOTTS — ATTITUDE TOWARDS HIS OPPONENTS — 'SELECT PREACHERS' STATUTE PASSED — MR. W. W. HULL'S PAMPHLET—DR. ARNOLD'S FEELING IN THE MATTER—LETTER FROM THE DUKE OF SUSSEX—CONVERSATION WITH AN UNITARIAN.

THE position in which Dr. Hampden found himself on the occasion of his appointment as Regius Professor of Divinity was a strange one for any man to be placed in: to awake one morning and find that he was suddenly regarded in a new and most unexpected light by those whom he had been daily meeting in friendly intercourse. He had taken no action himself, but gone quietly about the business which the University had entrusted to him, and in so open and direct a manner, that he might have taken to himself the words—'I ever taught in your streets; in secret I have done nothing: and not for an hour or a day, but through years.' And what had wrought this change? A reported letter from the Prime Minister with an offer of preferment. His first sensation was one of utter astonishment: it was a rough awakening. The second, something of pain and regret, that never left him, at the great want of kindness (nay, of ordinary courtesy) from many towards whom his sentiments had been always kind—kinder perhaps than they were aware. For his shyness made him always shrink from any display of his feelings. Still, many must have remembered the quiet confidence in their goodwill towards him with which he met them. After the first shock, he took the matter sadly home to

his heart, rarely speaking of it even in his family. And he went forth alone, calmly though resolutely, to meet the storm that had burst upon him. Conscious that neither in word, thought, nor deed he had provoked it, he believed in God that He would help him.

His name was made to ring through the land coupled with such hard terms as 'heretic,' 'latitudinarian,' 'sceptic.' In his 'Inaugural Lecture' he speaks of such charges as being obviously the most difficult to remove:—'They are of so vague a nature that each person adapts to them the chimera of his own fears and fancies, and there is no knowing to what point to address a refutation. A refutation in fact is impossible, of the ten thousand opinions by which so vague a charge may be interpreted.'* Detached passages were taken from his works, even in half-sentences, and italics added. Such a mode of proceeding seems like to one sending a challenge to an adversary, and then taking an opportunity of tampering with his weapons. For, to an author, are not his words, his sentences, as he himself places them, his weapons? It is true, the extracts brought together in this manner were prefaced with high-sounding phrases—

Kühn war das Wort, weil es die That nicht war.†

'Nothing,' as Dr. Hampden himself said, 'is easier than to detach sentences from the context and general scheme of an author's observations, and to found on them almost any charge which an objector's own views may suggest. It is but a light task to leave out what explains, or qualifies, or restricts, the meaning of the sentences, and to give them a repulsive air by the hardness and crookedness of the sense put upon them. It is a familiar rhetorical art, *affingere vicina virtutibus vitia*, and to make an author guilty of the paralogisms of his perverse or ignorant interpreter. All this is easy enough. But when

* *Inaugural Lecture*, p. 26.

† Schiller, *Wallenstein's Tod*, 1ter Aufzug, 4ter Auftritt.

once suspicions have been scattered among the public, it is no light task to undo the delusion. The sophistry may be exposed, but the impression on the mind of many remains; all have not the power to revert to their former simplicity: their feelings have been alienated, and they hear only to disapprove and condemn.

'I do not mean to impute misconstruction of an author's meaning in all instances to the fault of the person who misconstrues it. It may be often due to the ambiguity of words and forms of expression. Unless an author therefore can claim (which I am far from doing) to have in every case most scrupulously guarded his expressions, so as to render mistake of his sense unavoidable, candour requires him to take to himself some portion of the blame of being misunderstood. I am not therefore obstinately bent on maintaining the use of particular words, which, however unexceptionable in my own view, appear objectionable to others. Though I may think their objection in reality unfounded, yet, as all writing is relative to instruction, I am quite sensible of the necessity of adapting phraseology to the apprehension of the hearers, and ready to avail myself of my experience of what is easily understood or not, in order to adopt the best mode of conveying the truth.

'But there is a misconstruction of an author which is not his fault. It is the overlooking the main drift of his argument—the singling out passages for a particular purpose, perverting them to a sense not the author's, as I remarked just now—the fastening on him the consequences drawn by the objector—the giving an undue prominence to what are only subordinate parts of his argument to be understood with reference to his whole design; or if the passages be really important, attributing to them an importance which he had not in view. In these and other ways an author may be greatly misrepresented, and a sensitiveness of objection may be created

against his statements which precludes all fair and reasonable hearing of his real argument.'*

It had been the custom of the bishops to require from all candidates for ordination a testimonial from the Regius Professor of having attended his course of Divinity lectures. This testimonial the Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Phillpotts) thought fit to dispense with at this time; and he wrote to the Professor to acquaint him with the change. The following letter was written by Dr. Hampden in reply:—

Dr. Hampden to the Bishop of Exeter.

St. Mary Hall: March 8, 1836.

I beg leave to return my thanks for the favour of your communication. I of course have no right to make any remark on what your lordship may require of candidates for holy orders; nor am I entitled to consider your dispensing with my testimonial as any disrespect to myself. I would only make my acknowledgments for the manner in which you have intimated your intention to me. May I be allowed to take this opportunity of stating that, in my 'Bampton Lectures,' the work which my adversaries here have invidiously attacked, I had no other object but to give a history of some leading technical terms of theology. The line of observation which I took in that work is quite new, even to the generality of studious readers, and it is not to be wondered at, therefore, that there should be some misconceptions of my argument. But I have been surprised to find some persons (and it is the mistakes and misstatements of these that have occasioned the present outcry) so grossly perverting my meaning, as often to fasten on me as my own conclusions, what I have given only as the reasoning of others; and to construe an account of mere phraseology into an explanation of the doctrines themselves expressed by it. I do not pretend to have put forth a perfect work in that or anything else I have written. But I solemnly assert that, in all that I have written, I have had the most sincere and earnest intention of maintaining the truths of Scripture, as taught in the Articles and Formularies of the Church, and that all my

* *Inaugural Lecture*, p. 27.

expressions naturally admit of this bearing. I trust that time and calm reflection will convince the public of this; but no reason can be heard amidst the present storm. It may, however, enable your lordship to judge in some measure of the character of the opposition by which I have been assailed, if I refer you to some of the works of those who have taken a lead on this occasion—the 'Tracts for the Times,' printed here, especially the latest tracts in the collection, those on Baptism by Mr. Pusey; and the third volume of 'Parochial Sermons,' by Mr. Newman, particularly Sermons 13th and 14th of that volume.

May I further take the liberty of appealing to your lordship's candour for an enlarged judgment of the tendency of my theological teaching, from a survey of all my writings, and not from one or two directed to a peculiar purpose, to which attention has now been exclusively called? Even, however, looking at my 'Bampton Lectures' alone, I could mention instances of serious Christians who have read them without perceiving any dangerous tendency in the argument, and who have expressed to me the Christian instruction they have received from them.

The difference of his theological opinions from those of the party who opposed his appointment, was not in stronger contrast than the tone and temper in which he met the opposition. Fearlessly as he always stated his own opinions, he is cautious when he speaks of the opinions of those who differ from him. In the rare instances in which he refers directly to publications, as in the letter to Bishop Phillpotts, he gives neither 'extracts' nor 'statements,' but he refers to the work in question, or the chapter, or the page, and invites the enquirer to meet the author on his own terms. No hurry or anxiety for success made him indifferent to the means employed to secure it. Many of his friends were desirous of a more combined effort in his favour; he invariably replied to the same effect:—'There is no chance, of course, of our being able to throw out the statute, but a good minority will be everything. It is matter, however, of great regret to me

to give so much trouble and inconvenience to my good friends. I think it will be better that we should not resort to any of the electioneering methods which have been employed on the other side, and, therefore, that there should be no committee.' Again, he writes in reply to a friendly offer of support in Convocation :—'I shall feel very greatly obliged by your support, and that of any member of Convocation with whom you may possess any influence. I would not presume to ask such a favour as that you should come up to Oxford purposely for the occasion, but for the great importance of the question at stake, which is no less than the freedom of thought and writing.'

A few slight lines of a hastily written note, in which he asks a friend's assistance in the duties at St. Mary Hall, unimportant as they are, mark how mindful of others he was even under the pressure of such trying circumstances :—'Could you oblige me by looking after my men here for the next three days? I am going to London in the course of to-day. But let me observe that I would have you consider whether your being known to assist me in the duties here would be at all prejudicial to you with reference to the Moral Philosophy chair; and if so, do not hesitate to refuse. I have time yet to make some other arrangement before I go.'

Little as this Christian temper of mind availed at the moment, in later years it was keenly felt by many, and a change of feeling towards him was expressed, under circumstances and in a manner peculiarly gratifying.

The late Rev. John Miller, of Bockleton, the author of one of the angriest pamphlets at this time (1836), many years afterwards meeting him as Bishop of Hereford, subsequently wrote to him as follows :—'There was a friendliness of manner in your lordship's recognition of me at Tenbury on Monday last, which makes me unwilling not to express my sense of it, and to give distinct evidence

of a like good spirit in return. If I refrain from any reference to the past, in a case where time would appear to have done its healing work silently and effectually, it is not because I feel that there is nothing which might otherwise call for explanation on my part, but only from a persuasion of there being much truth in the adage, that "least said is soonest mended." I should imagine that, in most passing estrangements, earnest and honest men would be well content to make mutual retrospective admissions, were it not an unfortunate tendency of experience to show the danger of too much openness and candour. I beg, therefore, simply to thank your lordship, and to observe that anything like personal ill-will between us must have been impossible, looking back from this day to that when we were brother-curates (as I believe) on either side of Shrivenham, with good Archdeacon Berens between us—not to keep the peace, but to be the friend and encourager of both.'

But to return to the earlier period with which the present portion of these pages is occupied.

The adverse statute, that had been dismissed from Convocation by the veto of the Proctors,* was again brought forward in May and passed Convocation, there having been a change of Proctors, and those then in office being men of different calibre from the former ones.

Several pamphlets were published by persons interested for Dr. Hampden, and in favour of the views maintained in his writings. The author† of a pamphlet entitled, 'Remarks Intended to Show How Far Dr. Hampden may have been Misunderstood and Misrepresented during the Present Controversy at Oxford,' says in a note:—'His opinions (Dr. Hampden's) are known to me only by his own four books, and if I have stated any

* See p. 67.

† William Winstanley Hull, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law, formerly Fellow of Brasenose College.

of them erroneously, it has not been by turning them to the bad side. We have not met since 1814, when I took my degree.' The pamphlet was sent to the Professor, who wrote his acknowledgments to the author, and stated his conviction that the pamphlet would be of service to the cause for the very reason which the author considered in the light of an objection—that it was the work of a layman, and of one on whom he had no personal claims of friendship. He went on to say:—

Dr. Hampden to Mr. W. W. Hull.

I beg to make the most implicit declaration to you of my continuing unchanged in those views of Christian doctrine which are contained in my fourth sermon; and you are quite at liberty to make any use of it in the way you propose. I may perhaps have made some slight verbal corrections in the proof, but I am not sure that I have. But when I accept your kind proposal, allow me to add that I do so with the reserve due to your own feelings, and would be understood, as far as my wishes are concerned, still to leave the matter open to your free deliberation. Personal controversy is what I have studiously avoided myself, having observed how much uneasiness it produces, and how little it conduces to the attainment of truth. I would not, therefore, say anything to involve another in such a course. You will probably have seen Mr. Woodgate's pamphlet. I have not read it, but I have understood he takes a strange line of argument, built on a false analogy between differences of opinion in religion, and differences of right and wrong in morals—as if looking charitably at the religious opinions of others were the same thing as a person being moral himself, but excusing or making light of immorality in another.

From another letter to Mr. Hull the following extract is taken:—

St. Mary Hall: April 22, 1836.

The ground which the party is now taking is still worse than anything they have already done. The effect which they are

trying to produce was evidenced to me by an anonymous letter I received this morning signed 'A Graduate of the University,' with the post-mark 'Burford.' Speaking of 'the belief of many that your inaugural lecture was got up merely to serve a present purpose, and that consequently all confidence in your sincerity should cease,' the writer says, 'I confess that I know nothing of your writings, but from what I have read in the "Elucidations" and Mr. Pusey's pamphlet. In these pamphlets there is apparently enough to lead a sober-minded and scripturally taught individual to regret that such speculations and observations should have been the production of a member, much less of a minister, of our Church.' The writer further professes his regret at hearing that 'the matter is likely to be renewed,' and that for his part he could 'trust' my 'sincerity.' But his manner of writing shows the effect which the party are now labouring to produce, and than which nothing can be more scandalous. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, that the public should be fully aware in what way the several publications against me have proceeded in making out their case; and this I think your pamphlet shows distinctly and conclusively.

In the pamphlet referred to, the extracts are placed side by side with the passages from which they had been disjointed. Each member of Convocation might certainly have pursued this investigation for himself. And when public attention was called to the manner in which the published extracts had been made, some persons did inquire for themselves; and both in 1836, and afterwards in 1847, remarkable instances occurred of many such persons acknowledging the totally different impression made upon them by the passages as they stand in the original work. Still, few of the crowd who assembled in Convocation on this occasion as judges of doctrine and opinion were likely to have ability or time for such careful study. Nor is it likely that they would have considered it necessary. A remarkable passage in the 'Life of Dr. Arnold' refers especially to this point. It says:—

'His (Dr. Arnold's) feelings at this juncture were shared in some respects by many others. Many who in general opinion widely differed from him, were yet equally with himself persuaded that there was great unfairness in the extracts then made from Dr. Hampden's writings; nor is there any reason for believing that the most eminent of Dr. Hampden's opponents had any sympathy with the conduct and feeling of the great mass of their supporters. But there were several points which combined to make it peculiarly exasperating to himself. The very fact of an opposition to an appointment, which on public grounds he had so much desired, was in itself irritating; the accusations, which, whether just or unjust, were based on subtle distinctions alien alike to his taste and his character, and especially calculated to offend and astonish him, the general gathering of the clergy, both of those whom he regarded as fanatics, and those whom he emphatically denounced as the party of Hophni and Phinehas, to condemn, in his judgment, on false grounds, by an irregular tribunal, an innocent individual, provoked in equal measure his anger and his scorn, his sense of truth and justice, and his natural impetuosity in behalf of what he deemed to be right.'*

Besides the votes obtained by means of extracts so made, the political element was strongly brought into play to swell the majority in the Oxford Convocation. The Government of Lord Melbourne was unpopular with the main body in the University, and also with the country clergy, at that time.

The following extract is from a letter of H.R.H. the Duke of Sussex, which expresses the independent opinion of one of high station, whose only acquaintance with Dr. Hampden was through his published writings, but whose generosity of feeling towards one placed in such trying circumstances is freely expressed:—

* *Life of Dr. Arnold*, vol. ii. p. 8.

H.R.H. the Duke of Sussex to Dr. Hampden.

Kensington Palace: June 5, 1837.

. . . . I have arrived at that time of life when subjects of this kind are considered with more calmness than at an earlier period, and I must say that I viewed and learned with the deepest concern the unfair and unjust attacks which were made on your first edition of the 'Bampton Lectures;' and they were rendered the more disreputable, as the works had never been noticed in a hostile manner until a public testimony of the approval of a Liberal Government had been conferred on you; thus I fear evincing that jealousy, not justice, was the prompter to such acts. Time, which is the best calmer of all passions, will, I trust, bring many to their senses who now seem to labour under a brain-fever; when I have no doubt they will see their errors, be sorry for the mischief they have inflicted on society and the personal wrong done to you, and make that apology which, as honest men, they ought to do.

The following fragment of a conversation which took place about this time between an Unitarian bookseller and a friend * of the Regius Professor represents in some degree the opinions of a certain class with respect to the Oxford agitation of 1836 :—

'Well, Mr. H., what do you think of the Oxford proceedings with respect to Dr. Hampden?'

Mr. H.: 'Very glad to see things taking the turn they do.'

'Why so?'

Mr. H.: 'You know my opinions on theological matters are in conformity with the Unitarians, and I naturally wish them to be more propagated. We certainly do not acknowledge Dr. Hampden as one of us; but, as a Liberal head in the University, he might have succeeded in getting the Dissenters admitted, which would have been very unfortunate for us. The sons of our rich Unitarians would

* Colonel Moody, R.E.

have gone then, and nine out of ten would have gone over to the Church. A friend of mine (Mr. S——, formerly M.P. for Norwich), the other day was complaining of his folly in letting two of his sons go to Cambridge, the consequence of which is, they have both abandoned their father's creed.'

CHAPTER VIII.

THE 'DUBLIN REVIEW' ON THE AGITATION—SECOND EDITION OF 'BAMPTON LECTURES'—'INTRODUCTION' PREFIXED—DR. HAMPDEN'S ENTRY ON HIS WORK AS REGIUS PROFESSOR—RESULTS—LETTER TO MR. W. W. HULL—TO ARCHBISHOP WHATELY—ATTITUDE AS REGARDS THE TRACT PARTY—DR. ARNOLD'S VIEW OF DR. HAMPDEN'S POSITION—CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON (1837).

THE excitement that began at Oxford spread far and near, and seems to have occupied the attention of all classes and men of all shades of opinion.

The 'Dublin Review' (a Roman Catholic publication) of May 1836 discusses the case for the instruction of its readers. It confesses itself fairly puzzled to understand the views held by those who protested so loudly against the Regius Professor. The Reviewer says: 'We feel obliged to confess, that, in looking over the controversial tracts which the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the theological chair of Oxford has called into being, our minds have been crossed by feelings, which we scarcely know how to reconcile together, or even to analyse, with satisfaction to ourselves. On the one hand we see learned and zealous, and we have reason to believe, in some instances, amiable men, contending, in the spirit which belongs to a better church and a better cause, in favour of a rigid adherence to principles and doctrines which *we* must approve; yet, thereby departing from the consistency of their professed faith, and betraying how powerless they are in wielding the weapons which it has long since blunted, and then thrown aside.'

While reviews and pamphlets were falling around him

like leaves in autumn, the Professor was calmly 'minding his business:' not indifferent, but applying himself to his own work with the persistency which so essentially belonged to his character. On the publication of the second edition of his 'Bampton Lectures,' he wrote an Introduction; his object in so doing is best told in his own words. After referring to the attacks made on him and his works, he says: 'Some may have thought, that I have been wanting to myself, in not entering into personal controversy with my adversaries; and may have expected, that I should at least show some impatience under unmerited attacks, some anxiety to vindicate myself from calumnious imputations.

'First then, I would observe, that I am, by natural disposition, utterly averse to polemical disputation. I prefer leaving the cause in the hands of the public; having no desire, that anything advanced in my writings should stand its ground by the temporary aid of argumentative defence; and being perfectly content that it should fall, if unable to abide the test of time. I do not mean to say that theological controversy may not be carried on in a Christian spirit; and that it may not sometimes do good. But its observed tendency is to hurt the Christian temper; and its use as an instrument of truth is extremely hazardous.

'In the next place, I have not felt that the writings so vehemently railed against, have been *substantially* assailed. I have been distressed—who cannot have been distressed?—to see questions of truth, of religious truth above all, arbitrated, like measures of political expediency, by personal and party influence, by appeals to feelings and prejudices, by the gathering of numbers, and the loudest cry. But where was the argument, where the evidence of truth, in such proceedings? So far as they admitted an answer, they have received it in the sentence of public opinion. Setting aside however these unargumentative

attacks,* I have really seen nothing in those professedly argumentative, that should demand an answer. I am not singular in discovering, even in this class, much to offend the dispassionate inquirer. What was wanted, was, temperate, and learned, and well-reasoned discussion of the points at issue. Has such appeared? Of the reverse has there not been abundance?

'At the same time I do not presume to assert, that my publications are without fault. Probably there are faults and mistakes in them. Imperfections there are doubtless. And I am quite ready to take blame to myself, if by an incomplete development of my views I should have given occasion to any single-minded reader to misapprehend my meaning, and adopt an error. But it does not appear, that any such reader has been misled. On the contrary, I have the testimony of many to the right impressions which they have received from a perusal of my Bampton Lectures and other publications. My present assailants certainly have made a great parade of objections. With a minute diligence, they have turned over the leaves, and drawn their line on many a passage and many a word. But with all these painful efforts, they have made out no case against my argument. I see no reason, from what they have alleged, for changing a single opinion, or retracting a single statement. Nor indeed, in that posture of mind in which they applied themselves to the work of criticism, were they likely to discover any real objections. My writings, it is clear, have been searched by them for evidence of principles to which they were themselves previously opposed, and in *justifi-*

* In the *Recollections of Oxford* by G. V. Cox, mention is made of two publications by Mr. Lancaster, of Queen's College, one of which, Mr. Cox says, was 'accompanied with a correspondence (of 75 pp.) with some of the Oxford authorities, in connection with, and expressive of, poor Mr. Lancaster's trouble and indignation at *losing his preaching-turns* from Queen's College, in consequence of coarse invectives (e.g. "that atrocious Professor") hurled by him from St. Mary's pulpit at Dr. Hampden!'

cation of a course of conduct to which they were already committed. And it seems a superfluous labour to address refutation to constructions and arguings, which derive their being and form from particular minds, and are not based on free and large grounds of inquiry.

'Still, as public attention has been so earnestly importuned to my writings, I have thought it advisable to avail myself of the call for another edition of my Bampton Lectures, to give a general introduction to the views contained in them. The work itself, being originally intended for a learned audience, may not unreasonably appear difficult to some persons, even if there were no prejudices excited in their minds against it. It seems expedient, therefore,—especially as the work will now undoubtedly find its way to a much larger circle,—to prepare the general reader for entering on the argument, by some preliminary observations.

'More particularly, now that much party-colouring has been scattered over it, I feel it but due to my station, and to the cause of truth,—which I firmly hold to be on the side of that work,—to endeavour to smooth the access to it, and show, that candid readers have no real ground for regarding it with suspicion. I have no expectation, in doing so, that anything I may say, will reconcile the determined controversialist. Such an expectation would not be warranted by experience. I shall be happy, if, on the whole, but one ray of light shall fall on the cloud of his misconceptions.'*

He now took up his residence at Christ Church, and entered on the duties of his office. He began a course both of public and private lectures. Amidst many troubles and anxieties he had the great and crowning happiness of feeling that, notwithstanding the many difficulties and hindrances, his sincere endeavours to do his

* Introduction to *Bampton Lectures*, third edition, p. xvii.

duty were so far successful, that his lectures were far more numerously attended than any Divinity lectures previously, and that his audience were interested in, and grateful for, his instruction. And in after years his counsel and advice were asked by those who had listened to and remembered his teaching as Regius Professor. Such testimony as this was peculiarly gratifying to him, and moved his feelings deeply: it made him, he would say, 'feel humble and thankful.' In letters to friends he dwells with pleasure on the success of his lectures. To Mr. W. W. Hull he writes:—

Dr. Hampden to Mr. W. W. Hull.

I fear you may have thought me ungrateful for all your kindness in not sooner making my acknowledgments and thanking you, too, for your last letter. But then I have been so closely and so anxiously engaged in the meantime, that I am sure you have made every allowance for me. The fact is, that the course of lectures, which I determined on giving against all probability of my being ready with them at the time appointed, have kept me incessantly at work—and that amidst sundry interruptions from calls and little matters of business. But now, I am happy to say, I have a little breathing time, and I take the first opportunity of writing to you. And I am sure too you will be happy to learn that the lectures have *succeeded* to the utmost of the good wishes of my friends. I had a class of upwards of an hundred—a good commentary on the *nullam fiduciam* clause; as far as I could observe all seemed animated by the best spirit.

The party's Professor,* the Lady Margaret, was stirred up to rub the dust off his arms and enter into a contest of doing good with me; which I did not at all regret, as there is plenty of room in the field, and the more jealousy we can have in this way the better. I hope, indeed, after the vacation to bring a still stronger force, in the form of additional lectures, as I

* The Lady Margaret's Professor was substituted for the Queen's Professor in the statute passed against Dr. Hampden in 1836 (see pp. 65, 77).

think it will be desirable to organise a board, with the Regius Professor at the head, to lecture simultaneously in different departments of Theology,* and so as to take in men of different standing in the University by lectures adapted to each class.

. . . . . .

The reports I hear of C.'s pamphlet agree with what you say of it. It is chiefly, I hear, against Arnold—*solido inlidet dentem.* Mr. C. is well known for his vehemence and asperity. In this case, I suppose, he is the organ of the old High Church.

To Archbishop Whately he gives a further account of what was then passing :—

Dr. Hampden to Archbishop Whately.

My dear Archbishop,—I must not defer longer thanking you for kindly sending me your late Charge and the little Tract on the Irvingites. I have read them all with great interest. The latter goes beyond the Irvingites and extends to some other persons of the present day, who expect that themselves and their dicta should be viewed with the deference due to Apostles.

You will be glad to hear that all is quiet here now, at least on the surface. On taking up my residence here, I have been received with great courtesy. I wish, of course, to meet all demonstrations of goodwill in a conciliatory spirit. But I cannot help feeling uncomfortable when I think of the maxim *oderunt quem læserint.* May it prove false in my case at least.

I have delivered in a protest to the Vice-Chancellor against the nomination of Select Preachers under their late iniquitous statute. In the meantime the case is still before the Attorney-General and Dr. Lushington, waiting their final opinion as to the right of appeal. They still hold their opinion given in the former case that the statute is illegal. The point now to be decided is, whether the King is Visitor in his civil capacity or only *jure ecclesiastico.*

I am going on quite prosperously with my public lectures,

* This was afterwards accomplished. See p. 114.

in point of attendance, so that the adversaries have accomplished nothing against me in that way, with all their efforts, and even with Bishop Phillpotts to their support.

. . . . . .

I do not feel satisfied (as who can?) with the present state of theological instruction in the University, and I am desirous of receiving your advice on the subject. My idea is, that there should be a board of lecturers established by the Regius Professor and acting in concert with him, in the University. But perhaps there would be much opposition to such a plan.

With our united kind regards to Mrs. Whately, believe me to remain, yours faithfully and affectionately,

R. D. HAMPDEN.

Deeply as he was impressed with the feeling that the great charge he had undertaken was 'sowing the wheat' rather than 'uprooting the tares,' nevertheless, when the occasion demanded, his opinion was unhesitatingly expressed, that the views put forward by the Tract party had been the cause of great evil in the Church, and had produced a natural—though much to be deplored—reaction in the disparagement of all authority.* In a letter to Archbishop Whately, he says:—

* The following extract from the interesting memoir of Arthur Hugh Clough affords an illustration of this:—

'For a time Clough was carried away, how far, it is impossible with any approach to certainty to say, in the direction of the new opinions. He himself said afterwards, that he had been "like a straw drawn up the draught of a chimney," yet in his mind the disturbance was but temporary. His own nature before long reasserted itself, proving by the strength of its reaction how wholly impossible it was for such a character to accept any merely external system of authority. Still, when the torrent had subsided, he found that not only had it swept away the new views which had been presented to him by the leaders of the Romanizing movement, but also it had shaken the whole foundations of his early faith, and had forced him to rely upon his own endeavours in the search after that truth which he still firmly believed in.'—*Poems and Prose Remains of Arthur Hugh Clough, &c.* vol. i. p. 14.

Dr. Hampden to Archbishop Whately.

There is one feature in the case which perhaps it has not occurred to you to notice: the extreme arrogance, and assumption of importance, on the part of the leading agents in the persecution. They exhibit themselves before the public as the living representation of their own extravagant and false theory of tradition. They expect to be listened to accordingly as sacred oracles, as carrying weight in their ministerial capacity. Holding themselves as the proper maintainers of the divine apostolical tradition, the true inheritors of what Keble calls the 'episcopal grace,' they feel themselves far above the condition of mere teachers and persuaders of men. The various manifestos and papers which they have published, will stand as singular monuments of this overbearing, anti-Christian spirit, as I should call it. It is no wonder that persons actuated by such a spirit should be despisers of all authority except that which founds itself on views such as their own, and while they profess the highest reverence for Church authority in the abstract—authority, *i.e.*, grounded on their theory of tradition—treat with disrespect any existing authority, or an actual minister of religion not of their party. In fact, we are come to this point, that we must debate afresh the grounds on which the Reformation * was established, and once more settle the

* 'It is a curious case, and is completely, to my mind, a repetition of the scenes of the Reformation. When Peter Martyr went down as Divinity Professor to Oxford in Edward VI.'s time, he was received by the Catholics with precisely the same outcry with which Hampden has been received by the High Churchmen, and on the same grounds. I think that the Evangelicals have in some instances been led to join in the clamour against him, from their foolish fondness for their particular phraseology, and from their want of ability to recognise the real features of any movement of opinion. About fifty or sixty years ago, when there was really a leaven of Socinianism in the Church, it showed itself in petitions to be relieved from the Articles, and in the absence of a strongly marked Christian character in the writings of the petitioning party. But Hampden is doing what real Christian reformers have ever done; what Protestants did with Catholicism, and the Apostles with Judaism. He upholds the Articles as true in substance, he maintains their usefulness, and the truth and importance of their doctrines; but he sees that the time is come when their phraseology requires to be protested against, as having, in fact, obstructed and embarrassed the recep-

rule of faith, whether we are to follow the rule of Scripture alone or receive also an 'unwritten word' parallel with the Scripture and independent of Scripture, in spite of the plain doctrine of our Articles on the subject.

In the course of the year 1837, he had a lengthened correspondence with the Duke of Wellington, the Chancellor of the University, relating to St. Mary Hall. It appears that information had been privately sent to the Duke to the effect that Dr. Hampden, as Principal of St. Mary Hall, was not acting in strict accordance with the statutes, because he was not residing within the walls. Doubtless the information had been conveyed by no friendly hand, and was so worded as to give to the Duke an impression exactly the reverse of the truth—namely, that the Headship (of which he as Chancellor was the patron) was made a sinecure by the then Principal. The Duke seems to have taken this information on its own showing, without any investigation into the grounds of the accusation. Some notion of this sort may have occurred to him at a later period; for he most positively refused his consent to the publication of the correspondence, though Dr. Hampden was anxious that it should be printed at the time: the real state of the case being, that Dr. Hampden continued to hold the Headship of the Hall in deference to the opinion of friends in whose judgment he had great confidence, and who considered that while the factious opposition to his appointment lasted (in the form of the statute) he ought to retain it. On this account he held it, to his own inconvenience. Any one at all acquainted

tion of the very truths which they intend to inculcate. He is engaged in the same battle against technical theological language, to which you and I have, I believe, an equal dislike; while he would join us thoroughly in condemning the errors against which the Articles were directed, and holds exactly the language and sentiments which Cranmer and Ridley, I believe, would hold if they were alive now.'—*Life of Dr. Arnold* (Letter to the Rev. J. Hearn), vol. ii. p. 31.

with the University must have felt the ingratitude, the injustice, of such a supposition as the one implied, seeing that it was Dr. Hampden, as Principal, who had converted the Hall from a sort of tumble-down hotel into a place of education, had spent large sums of money on it, had laboured indefatigably there, and was still working there with the assistance of a thoroughly efficient Vice-Principal (the Rev. W. Hayward Cox), a 'first class' man of great experience in the University.*

This somewhat curious correspondence had no result. Dr. Hampden's only remark upon it in a letter to a friend was: 'I wish he could not have destroyed my illusion as to his being a magnanimous person.'†

* See the account given by the Rev. W. Sinclair, M.A. (Rector of Pulborough, Sussex), p. 31.

† Reference may be made here to the position which the Duke had taken when applied to in 1836 by Dr. Hampden to investigate the proceedings of the Board of Heads with reference to the illegality of the proposed statute. See Appendix B., *post*.

CHAPTER IX.

DISCUSSION IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS ON DR. HAMPDEN'S CASE—LORD RADNOR—DUKE OF WELLINGTON—LORD BROUGHAM—LORD WINCHILSEA—ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY—LORD RADNOR IN REPLY—LETTER FROM DR. HAMPDEN TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

On December 21, 1837, the Earl of Radnor called the attention of the House of Lords to the subject of University Reform. In the course of his speech, he referred to the proceedings at Oxford in the case of Dr. Hampden, and said: 'He would not enter into the question, whether alterations of the statutes ought to originate with the Hebdomadal Board, or with the House of Convocation; for he was prepared to argue the total illegality and incapacity of the University to alter the statutes without the consent of the Crown.* . . . The University had, therefore, he contended,' committed a violation of the statutes 'in the insult they had offered to Dr. Hampden. Without any accusation having been made, they were at once the accusers, the judges, and the executioners. Dr. Hampden was living quietly in Oxford as Regius Professor; a Convocation was called, a great stir was made, the greatest activity was used to get up people from all parts of the country, and coaches drove into Oxford with men to give their votes who, to his (Lord Radnor's) certain knowledge, knew little about the matter, and had never read a single word of Dr. Hampden's works, save and except the extracts which his enemies had circulated against him. He believed he

* For the opinion of Sir John Campbell (Attorney-General) and Dr. Lushington, see p. 65.

could prove that at the bar. Those men came up to the Convocation, and passed the statute by which they declared that some of Dr. Hampden's writings contained such theology, *res theologica*, that the Convocation had no confidence in him, Dr. Hampden never having been summoned nor heard in his own defence. Indeed, one of the speeches at the Convocation made by the Warden of Merton* concluded thus:—"Where is the accuser? Where is the accused? What is the accusation?"'

The Duke of Wellington (the Chancellor of the University of Oxford), in his reply to Lord Radnor, made the following somewhat strange remark:—'Dr. Hampden had thought right, in his inaugural lecture, to state that he then felt it his duty to explain the opinions which had been complained of. It was not for him to pretend to judge either those opinions or that explanation; but this he would venture to say, and he believed their lordships would concur in the opinion, that in proportion as Dr. Hampden had found it necessary to give an explanation of his sentiments, in the same proportion were those justified who had thought proper to disapprove of them.'†

Lord Brougham 'protested against that part of the noble Duke's statement with regard to Dr. Hampden, in which he asserted that the explanation given by that gentleman of the opinions previously put forward by him afforded any justification of the charge which had been made against him on account of those opinions.'

Lord Winchilsea also remarked, 'that what had been said by Professor Hampden had been said only in explanation, and not in contradiction, of the opinions contained in the pamphlet which had called forth animadversions on the part of the University. Moreover, that explanation had not satisfied the great body of the

* Dr. Marsham.

† Much in the same way, the Catechism might be held to prove the objectors to the Christian religion to be in the right, because it explains some of the doctrines of that religion.

University as to Dr. Hampden's having renounced those opinions to which they were opposed.'

Viscount Melbourne (then at the head of his Majesty's Government) in the course of a speech on the same evening said:—'I certainly do not think that there is anything to be condemned in the writings of Dr. Hampden. They are upon points of extremely recondite and difficult scholastic learning. Very few of your lordships, indeed, have the means of forming any sound opinion upon such extremely difficult, abstruse, and obscure points as those. With respect to an intimation that was made to me upon the subject from the University of Oxford, it seemed to me to have been made by persons who were utterly ignorant of the writings of Dr. Hampden. I know very little upon the subject, and yet I believe I know more than those who have opposed the doctor's nomination.'

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Howley) spoke as follows:—'I should not have risen to say one word upon the motion, were it not for an observation which has fallen from the noble Viscount, the first Lord of the Treasury. I am certain that the noble Viscount did not mean any disrespect to certain persons who waited on him, relative to the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the Regius Professorship, when he stated that they appeared totally ignorant of the subject. I will not say whether I am ignorant of theology or not, nor whether I am more ignorant of it than the noble Viscount professes to be; neither will I now allude to the opinions of Dr. Hampden. These opinions were announced in several publications, and I believe they gave dissatisfaction in various quarters. They were, however, of a totally different character from the opinions which produced the Reformation, and the views of Mr. Locke. The question was, were the opinions maintained by Dr. Hampden consistent with the doctrines of the Church of England? Upon this point, I will

abstain from making any observation now. I will not attempt to go into the subject. But I felt it my duty to make some representations to the first Lord of the Treasury upon the appointment; and I appeal to those Ministers who were in power previous to the present Ministry—I appeal to the noble Duke (Wellington), and to a noble friend of mine who has just left the house, if I ever, upon any occasion, stood in the way of any man's preferment in the Church?*

'Nothing but a sense of duty could induce me to remonstrate against this or any other appointment; but Dr. Hampden having against him the great majority of the University, many also of the ablest divines, I do not think that my conduct ought to meet the ridicule of the noble Earl.'

In the course of a short reply at the close of the discussion, the Earl of Radnor said:—'It was all very well to say that it would be more discreet to observe silence on the case of Dr. Hampden, but it should be recollected that he was the party injured, traduced, and insulted. He believed him to be as honest, as virtuous, and as honourable a man as any living. He had no doubt that all the hostility to him in the University arose from his advocating the admission of the dissenters. His theology was never censured before. On the contrary, he was appointed to the Professorship of Moral Philosophy.'†

In consequence of the remarks made by Archbishop Howley in this debate, the Regius Professor of Divinity addressed the following letter to him. The correspondence was subsequently published in the form of a pamphlet.

There are points insisted on in this letter which deserve

* It is curious to remark how throughout the struggle the opposers maintained silence on the very point under dispute.

† This account of the debate is taken from *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, vol. xxxix. pp. 1386-1403.

special notice. More than any other document relating to the subject, it shows the earnest and eager manner in which Dr. Hampden desired that his opponents would speak out, and state the full meaning and extent of the charges against him. 'Out of respect to myself, out of respect to my office, out of respect to your office, I strongly feel, and urgently require, that I should no longer be the subject of mere vague imputations, but that the question, whatever it may be, between my adversaries and myself, should be fairly put to the issue, and, once for all, decided by the proper authority.' The man's whole heart is in this letter, and wounded feelings are manifest in it; but there is no shuffling, no whining, no made-up case; it is a straightforward appeal to justice. The following extract is given:

Dr. Hampden to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

When the Archbishop of Canterbury (as is reported) publicly declares himself opposed to a minister of the Church—when he speaks of him as one who for good reasons should not have been appointed to an high office in the Church—when he designates his opinions as objectionable to the best divines of the day, and characterises his appointment as injudicious and unfortunate—such words, from such an authority, cannot be suffered to fall to the ground, as if they had no important bearing on the individual to whom they refer. I may pass over, as I have passed over, the attacks of inferior men. But when the Archbishop of Canterbury publicly alludes to me in a slighting, disparaging manner, I cannot remain silent. Your grace's censures, certainly, were conveyed indirectly. They were framed in the language of caution and reserve. They were not so much an attack on me, as an apology for others. Still, I think, you must see, that the mode in which you referred to me, is calculated to make the most adverse impression on the public mind. The very indefiniteness of the charge against me, implied as it was, rather than expressed by your words, is, in truth, an aggravation of it. For it is open to any construction whatever; and may therefore be taken in the

most calumnious sense. The courteousness of phrase, and abstinence from direct censure, are in effect the most vituperative and injurious.

Think, my lord, how your words, as coming from one in high authority in the Church, may affect the character of one under that authority. Let me entreat you therefore to speak out, and say what is the full meaning and extent of your charge. I ask for specific allegations, if there be such—specific evidence of them. Out of respect to myself, out of respect for my office, out of respect to your office, I strongly feel, and urgently require, that I should no longer be the subject of mere vague imputations, but that the question, whatever it may be, between my adversaries and myself, should be fairly put to the issue, and, once for all, decided by the proper authority.

At present, the only thing ostensibly and actually alleged by your grace is, that a number of persons objected to my appointment, and communicated with you in order to prevent it. Hence, you conclude that it ought not to have taken place: whatever may have been the opinion of the Government in my favour, and however strong the testimonials by which that opinion was supported. In fact, the appointment was, in your grace's view, injudicious and unfortunate, because an active and powerful cabal was formed against it.

Now, my lord, is it not evident, that on the same grounds, the preferment of any one might be as easily objected to and obstructed?

For example, what would you have thought, if some of the citizens of Canterbury had formed a cabal to exclude you from the see? And might they not have met together and chosen a committee, and set themselves up as judges of your orthodoxy and fitness for the office, and published their manifestoes, and sent forth their libels against you by every post? Might they not too have indulged their mockery of all ecclesiastical authority, so far as to denounce you to your Sovereign as an heretic and a dangerous person,—and then, on your vindicating yourself, have had the effrontery to support their petition, on the ground, not that you were guilty, but that you came forward to vindicate your character,—it being, forsooth, essential that an Archbishop of Canterbury should need no vindication? What would your grace have said to all this in your

own case? Would you have conceded any authority whatever to such a tribunal, to take cognisance of your reputed heresy? Would you not rather have said? 'I deny your competence to pronounce an opinion on me in a question of heresy, or, put me on my trial. I disdain your self-appointed committee. I appeal to the regular Ecclesiastical Authorities. I demand to be heard by the Church, not by a tumultuous assemblage of persons calling themselves the Church, and rashly usurping its authority.'

In truth, my lord, if the government of the Church is to be a reality, and not a mere name—nay, if the Church is to subsist as a society on earth, such combinations as those which the conspirators against my appointment exhibited, ought to be put down, not encouraged. The destructive tendency of such licence as that assumed by them, is, to my mind, so very clear, that I cannot forbear bringing the case before you, in the light in which it appears to me. Evidently it has not struck your grace in the same point of view; or, I am sure, you would not have countenanced the Oxford proceedings in 1836, by attending to objections urged by the parties engaged in those proceedings, and covering them with the shield of your dignity. You would have felt, that to give a colour of ecclesiastical propriety to such proceedings was undermining the very authority which your grace is especially bound to protect,—that it was for those very hands to sow and water the seeds of schism, which should be the most diligent in uprooting them.

Let me, then, call your attention to the schismatical character of those proceedings. It is no question of the respectability of the individuals concerned in them. Let it be granted that they are the best of men, the best of divines, and that their language has been the most gentlemanlike, and courteous, and temperate. They are still schismatical, in so combining themselves, and acting together, as they have done. Let it be granted even that the person suffering at their hands deserves to suffer. *They*, at any rate, have no right to inflict the suffering; nor ought it to be inflicted *in that way*, any more than a criminal should suffer justice at the hands of an enraged mob. The offence of another is no justification of *their* offence in assuming a power which the constitution of the Church has not

given them, or of their mischievous example of contempt of the regular forms of the Church. Their conduct is still schismatical.

If we refer to the Scriptures, the articles and canons of the Church, and the ordination services, we find them uniformly condemning such proceedings on the part of members of the Church. Has not St. Paul expressly directed to 'mark them which cause divisions?' Has he not reprobated as 'carnal,' those among whom are 'envying, and strife, and divisions,'—one saying, 'I am of Paul,' another saying, 'I am of Apollos,'—men sitting in judgment on one another, being 'puffed up for one against another,'—'brother going to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers,' instead of submitting their grievances to the judgment of the Church? Has he not expostulated with those who listened to testimonies or complaints against himself from improper quarters, namely, from persons who took on themselves to examine and judge him and trespass on his Christian liberty? Has he not unceasingly exhorted to quietness, and gentleness, and patience,—censuring 'busy-bodies,' persons 'walking disorderly,' who neglect their own proper calling, while they intrude themselves into the concerns of others?

Looking to the articles and canons of the Church, there we find the same language. When a minister is condemned, the 26th article supposes a prescribed form to have been followed; that 'inquiry' has been made,—that there have been 'accusers' having 'knowledge' of the offence,—proofs of 'guilt,'—'just judgment.' By the 53rd canon 'public opposition between preachers' is expressly guarded against; not only as carried on in the pulpit, but any opposition 'purposely' set on foot by the clergy, of their own motion; and it is directed, that all such matters of offence are to be, in the *first* instance, laid before the Bishop, and that nothing is, in any case, to be done without his order first had on the subject.

Looking, lastly, to the ordination services, there we meet with the like care for the preservation of the order and unity of the Church. Every word in these, is a prohibition of the meddling, factious spirit. The minister indeed is exhorted to activity in defence of the truth; he must 'banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's

word.' But the sphere of his exertion is also pointed out; and his attention is called to his own 'cure,'—to 'those committed to his charge.' The adoption of this form of admonition in our service, instead of that of the Roman Pontifical, which enjoins to 'pronounce an anathema against every heresy which lifts itself against the holy Catholic Church,' shews, further, what sort of zeal against error the framers of our service inculcate. Clearly, they enjoin on the minister no other method, but the gentle one of argument and persuasion,—or the use of 'public and private monitions and exhortations within his cure.' They give no warrant to that discursive activity, which goes out of its way to fight with error, nor heeds how peace and love may be violated so that its zeal may spend itself.

So strongly opposed to Scripture and to the sober spirit of our Church, is the character of the late movement at Oxford. One would really think, that the authors of it had read 'Agitate, Agitate,' in every page of their instructions, instead of exhortations to quietness and peace and love; and that the Apostle had nowhere said, that 'the servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves,' and, again, 'Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father.'

Your grace, probably, knows of that movement only in the result, by the communication made to you by certain members of the University. You cannot, I conceive, be aware of the meetings that were held, the printed papers that were issued, the tone of oracular self-confidence, and spiritual importance, in which the leaders of the movement decried and denounced a brother clergyman. Had all this come under your notice, you could not but have seen the schismatical character of the proceedings fully developed. As it is, your grace appears to me, only to have heard the gentle footsteps, and subdued tone, with which they ushered themselves into your presence.

Is your grace fearful that the intoxication of this party, if restrained, will turn to madness?—To conciliate men who have been engaged in such a course,—to soften matters, when they have reached such a crisis,—will hardly produce even temporary quiet, much less consult for the permanent peace of the Church. In the natural progress of things, indeed, a reaction will take place, and schism will rise up to put down

20592

schism. But, would it not be far safer, and better in every way, that the authorities of the Church should interpose to stay the plague?

But your grace may still urge, that the question does not, in your apprehension, turn on the point whether I am right in my 'views and intentions,' and my opponents wrong in their conduct, but 'on the impression which certain parts of my writings are calculated to make, and have actually made, on the minds of common readers, as well as of persons well versed in theology.'

I would most especially request your grace to state, whether you have read my writings, and whether they made on your mind, the impression to which you refer. If so, I should be glad to have the passages to which you may object, pointed out to me; as I should be most happy to enter into a discussion of them, and endeavour to make my views better understood and more justly appreciated; feeling confident, as I do, that they really tend, at once, to the upholding of the truths of the Gospel, and of the scriptural teaching of our own Church.

As for the representations of my views, which have been given to the world, or carried to your grace's ear, by persons studiously opposed to me,—representations most unfair and uncandid,—I cannot suffer my writings to be interpreted by them —I cannot discuss them as any real objections.

It seems that your grace estimates the amount of objection to my writings as very great; and therefore sufficient to obstruct my appointment. I contend, on the contrary, that my writings have not produced an injurious impression on many minds. The mock elucidations of them given by others, may have done so, and very naturally, but not the writings themselves. The boasted number of objectors, may be clearly traced to a very few originators and promoters of the disturbance. The clamour of the many, was but the senseless echo of a few loud and importunate voices. When letters were written to all quarters from the centre of the movement in Oxford, pressing everyone into the service,—when the spirit of the Crusader and the Covenanter was once more evoked,—and men were challenged, on their faith, and their devotion to the Church, to give in their adhesion to the cause,—is it strange, that an impression was produced extensively against me, not

only at Oxford, but elsewhere—not only among persons 'well-versed in theology,' but among 'common readers,' or rather, no-readers of my works? What wonder, if, when the trumpet was sounded, and the alarm-bell was rung, the panic was spread far and wide!—What wonder if the opportunity was eagerly seized by the zealous, the fierce, and the timid, of having a hand in destroying a proclaimed enemy of the Church—of giving a blow to one already doomed—of standing over the fallen, and shouting the pæan of triumph!

Let me separate, however, the deluded and misled, for whom I make great allowance, and many of whom actuated, no doubt, at the moment of frenzy by good motives, have by this time, I trust, been undeceived. Let me inquire who those divines are, who are entitled to be leaders of opinion in the Church,—whose good report is so necessary to be obtained,—whose favour must be propitiated. Until their names, and their merits, are known, I cannot consider their abstract weight as anything in the scale against me. For my part I know of none whose opinion is entitled to such extreme deference,—certainly none amongst those who headed and brought up the array against me. Some of them, indeed, are absolutely nameless in the theological world; and there are also some, whose judgment must be set aside on your own principle;—their opinions being well-known and strongly objected to, both in Oxford and elsewhere.

But, my lord, I dispute altogether the propriety of testing an author by the 'impression' attributed to his writings. I regard the principle as essentially wrong. It is judging an author by the capacity, or the disposition, of his readers and interpreters, and not by his own spirit. It is saying, that because an author does not teach us what *we* approve, therefore he is incapable of teaching others aright,—that, because he is misunderstood or misapplied by some, therefore he must be misunderstood and misapplied by every one else, or by the generality. Still more striking is the impropriety of thus judging an author, when the 'impression' referred to, is an impression made on the minds of opponents,—of persons of a different school,—of men indisposed to like anything that proceeds from him,—when his judges look askance at him from his writings, and regard him with suspicion, as patronized by a

party in the state which they hold in abhorrence. I would ask, whether Romanists admit the Church of Rome to be corrupt, because Protestants assert it—whether Protestants admit themselves to be heretics, because Romanists assert it—whether Calvinists admit Calvinism to be immoral in its tendency, because some anti-Calvinists assert it—whether the Bible must be confessed to be Socinian, because Socinians draw Socinian doctrines from it—lastly, whether St. Paul must be censured, because his Epistles contain *some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction.*

How many excellent Divines of our Church might be censured, if their orthodoxy, and usefulness as Christian teachers, were estimated by such a test. Who, however, values Bishop Burnet's Exposition of the Articles, at all the less, because it was censured by the Lower House of Convocation? Your grace will remember the case of Bishop Bull; how this champion of the Nicene Faith pleads for himself against the iniquity of imputing to him the objections of adversaries. So industriously, and with such 'tragic' declamation, had he been complained of as a teacher of 'new and most pernicious doctrines,' that he was 'almost everywhere,' as he says, 'accounted a Socinian.' In a remarkable passage of his *Apologia pro Harmonia* (p. 10. ed. 1703), he thus expresses himself: 'In abstergenda hac de Socinismo calumnia eo diutius moratus sum, quòd et per se gravis illa sit, atque a multis resciverim, istam de me famam inimicorum meorum artibus et industria tum latè sparsam esse, ut jam penè ubique pro Socinista habear. Sane expertus loquor insignem calumniam non modo cessisse in familiæ meæ detrimentum, sed etiam successui laborum meorum in sacro ministerio (quod me angit maxime) gravi impedimento fuisse. Deus Opt. Max. ex effusissima ipsius misericordia gratiam illis largiatur, qua de tam atroci in fratrem suum injuria seriam et tempestivam agant pœnitentiam, ut tremendum illud judicium, quod in futuro sæculo calumniatores manet, effugiant. Interim me solabor benedictione Dei, Domini, ac Servatoris mei Jesu Christi, qui dixerit: *Beati eritis, quum vos convitiis affecerint et mentientes dixerint quidvis mali adversus vos propter me. Gaudete et*

exultate, quoniam merces vestra multa est in cœlis, etc. Matt. v. 11, 12.'*

In my own case, I consider such a mode of treatment peculiarly hard. When it is remembered that I was no unknown person, but that I had been living for a considerable time at Oxford in the public view, filling successively several offices of trust in the University, and among these that of Public Examiner for nearly four years—(the chief responsibility of which office lies in the examinations in divinity;)—that, subsequently to the delivery of my Bampton Lectures, I obtained in 1833 the honourable notice of our late learned and most distinguished Chancellor, in my appointment to the Headship of St. Mary Hall;—that I was elected in 1834 by the Vice-Chancellor and Proctors, the Heads of Christ Church, Magdalen, and St. John's, White's Lecturer in Moral Philosophy, for which the founder especially requires one 'recommended by his soundness of religion,' *religionis sinceritate commendatus*;—that I had published writings several years ago—one of which (a little tract containing sermons addressed to children) received your approval, and the other (an essay on the argument of Butler's Analogy) was sent to you with a letter from myself on the subject;—when all this is remembered, I do think it was peculiarly hard, that no weight was given by your grace to previous character and means of judging of me, but that a number of signatures, a memorial, and an outcry, should have been held by you as decisive of the propriety of excluding me

* 'I have dwelt the longer in wiping off this calumny of Socinianism, both because of its being grievous in itself, and of my having learned from many, that that character of me has, by the arts and industry of my enemies, been so widely spread, that I am now almost everywhere accounted a Socinian. In truth, I speak from experience when I say, that the notable calumny has not only turned to the detriment of my family, but also (which most afflicts me), has been a grievous impediment to the success of my labours in the sacred ministry. May the Infinitely Good and Great God, of His most abundant mercy, bestow on them the grace of a serious and timely repentance of so atrocious a wrong against their brother, that they may escape that tremendous judgment which awaits calumniators in the world to come. Meanwhile, I shall console myself with the benediction of God, my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who has said, *Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven, &c.* Matt. v. 11, 12.'

from a post, to which nothing but previous character and means of judging of me, had recommended me.

It was not decided in such a way, my lord, when those more than forty Jews banded themselves against St. Paul. The Roman governor required that *the accused should have the accusers face to face, and have licence to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him.* And when suspicion existed against the Apostle, and the disciples were afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple, their suspicion was overruled by the testimony given of his work in the Gospel. Had his case been decided at once by the evidence of the Jews against him, or by that of the disciples in their state of suspicion, how easily might even this chosen servant of his Lord have been condemned!

In my case, however, neither previous character, nor subsequent experience of me in the office itself, appears to have relieved your mind of the load of objection. At this time—at the interval of two years—your grace is found asserting the existence of 'good reasons' against my appointment, as if there had been, and were now, no reasons at all on the other side in favour of it—as if I had never said or done anything in justification of it; as if there stood only on one side of the question an insuperable mass of objection and complaint.

Let the objections of which your grace speaks be put in the most repulsive form. Let it be said that certain parts of my writings had not only been objected to, but had given offence to many persons.—Is nothing then to be written that may give offence to certain persons? Is nothing to be preached but what coincides with the views and feelings of the hearers? Doubtless it is better, if it be possible, to avoid giving offence. I would not, if I could help it, give offence to any one. Still it must happen sometimes, that things must be spoken which will to many be unpalatable, and on account of which he who gives utterance to them will incur dislike and obloquy. If such offence and dislike are to be construed into condemnation what will become of the cause of truth?—I question whether the Gospel itself would not be condemned by such an argument; for we know that at one time it was *everywhere spoken against.*

Consider, my lord, what the effect is likely to be on the

rising generation of theologians, if it go forth to the world that the Archbishop of Canterbury sanctions in any way the Oxford proceedings in 1836. Will honesty and intrepidity of inquiry, the qualities most essential to the investigation and acknowledgment of truth, be promoted by such a state of things as will follow? Will they not rather be intensely discouraged? No one, surely, will readily venture to state his opinions on any point, when he knows that there is a dominant party in the Church, and in the University, ready to sit inquisitorially on them—to pronounce an anathema upon them, and condemn their author by an arbitrary court, without a lawful judge—without a jury—without an accuser—without witnesses—without appeal—without mercy.

What servility! what hypocrisy! what irreligion, must not the establishment of such a system lead to! What else is it but all the horror of the Inquisition under the most subtle form! Already I fear the evil is in some degree felt at Oxford. It may be called, by some effeminate moralists, a state of docility and humble-mindedness; but it is not, I am sure, that docility and humble-mindedness which the Gospel contemplates; for that is no crouching, abject spirit, but a spirit of devotion to the Word of God, prompting to the searching of the Scriptures and ascertaining the truth by the conviction that God has spoken it.

Consider again, my lord, what evil must result from allowing, not to say the University, but a combination of individuals—a cabal—a schismatical body—to exercise a control over the Ecclesiastical appointments of the Crown. Would you place the patronage of the Crown, or any patronage, at the mercy of a party which happens to be in ascendancy in the University, or elsewhere? Is that patronage, then, to fluctuate with the Euripus of academical, or popular feeling? And is the object of it to be merely the representative of the theology of the day? I need not point out the obvious mischief portended by such a course to religion. It is evident also that the introduction of so great a licence must threaten the dissolution of the union now subsisting between the Church and the State, and tend to merge the power of the State in that of the Church—a result which some seem anxiously labouring to accomplish at this very time. It is, in fact, bringing in a democratic force

as a check on the royal prerogative, in the most objectionable form; because it is a force, not regulated by any fixed principle, but moulded and impelled at the moment by the prevailing opinions, feelings, and humours of the Clergy—a force, the more formidable from the awe of religion which surrounds it, and capable of the more disorder from the very associations of order which naturally belong to it. He cannot have read history, who does not see that the tendency of this power is to put every other power under its feet; and that it requires therefore to be strictly watched, and kept within the limits of the Constitution.

Finally, my lord, I once more throw myself on your justice. I ask you, as a steward of Christ, to whom much has been given for the good of the household of Christ, no longer to allow yourself to appear as the advocate of a majority, but to stand as an impartial judge between that majority and the other side, though there be on that other side only a minority of one. In a cause of truth and right, let numbers be put out of the question. Your own conscientious opinion, drawn from your own examination of my merits or demerits, can alone answer for you the question, whether I am fit, or not fit, for the office of Regius Professor of Divinity. Once more, I disclaim the calumnious imputations, whatever they may be, with which I have been assailed. I disclaim them for myself; I disclaim them for my writings. I retract nothing that I have written; I disown nothing. I fearlessly assert myself to have ever been, as I am now, a true member of the Church of England, and a faithful teacher of its doctrines. I challenge my enemies to prove the contrary. In other circumstances, it would be vain-glorying in me to speak of myself as I now do. Now, however, I am obliged to give expression to the full conviction of my own heart, and say without scruple, that I am not the man to hold an office in hypocrisy, or for the mammon and tinsel attached to it.

It is time, indeed, that an end were put to the vexatious warfare, with which I have been so seriously annoyed and interrupted in my duties. It is easy for those who estimate suffering by worldly privation and bodily pain, to say there has been no persecution in my case. It is easy for those who have acted against me, to say, they have had no personal object, and

have intended no disrespect to me, and have done me no wrong. But I must best know what I have suffered. I must best know the pain of being reviled—the still greater pain of being mocked with protestations of kindness and respect amidst indignities. If it were only the unmerited disesteem effected in the minds of good men, who have been misled in their judgments of me, I have had enough to make me feel acutely. Let those who have ever felt the pain of the evil eye, and the evil tongue, directed against them, speak to the case. Nor is it any slight thing, to encounter opposition in the discharge of one's duties, to have one's means of doing good thwarted to the utmost that disappointed rage can effect. This very occasion of defending myself, from the slight thrown on me by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords, is to me most painful. Those who know me, and my habits of life, will judge how very painful it must be to me. Providentially, I have been sustained under my trial, and, I trust, by the same Divine assistance, I shall still be sustained. Indeed, I have not been without my consolation in the midst of it. It has been no little relief to find, that not all who first joined against me, were actuated by a persecuting spirit. Happily, several have had the courage and the kindness to own their error, and have washed their hands of the pollution. I have had the elevating sympathy of pious, and zealous, and learned men, undoubted friends of the Church. And if testimonials are to be estimated not by number but by weight, I have judgments in my favour, that might counterbalance a host of declamatory objectors; such as that of the late Mr. Davison, the highly-gifted and excellent author of the 'Discourses on Prophecy,' who both read and expressly approved my Bampton Lectures, as well as my 'Essay on the Philosophical Evidence of Christianity.' Public opinion, too, has given me its support, in spite of all that has been done to corrupt its verdict. Another satisfaction has been derived to me from the kind feeling, which, greatly to their honour, the junior members of the University attending my lectures have evinced towards me. Above all, I am humbly persuaded, that my prayer for strength has been answered, in the calm which I feel in my mind, and the firm resolve with which I am nerved to perseverance in my course.

Still I feel myself the victim of a cruel persecution. A faction has been allowed to riot with impunity on the public stage of the University, and in the face of the authorities of the Church, and to bear me down, if I could have been borne down, by clamour and insult. Shall, then, such a state of things continue unnoticed and unredressed, and the injured person not indignantly complain of the wrong? I implore your grace, therefore, effectually to put an end to this unnatural warfare. I ask, as I have said, for specific charges, if such exist. I ask to be called to account before a legal ecclesiastical tribunal, if there be real matter of accusation against me.

Your grace desires me to satisfy the University; that is, in reality, a party opposed to me in the University. I declare to you, that I cannot satisfy them. It would be wrong, in the first place, that I should succumb to the requisitions of a body of men acting schismatically, as these have acted. They must rather first be reduced to a state of discipline. I cannot treat with a disorderly faction, assuming a power not given them by the Scriptures, or the rules of the Church. But, in the next place, it is a task of impossibility which you impose upon me. The person himself must be an anomaly who would meet the views of such an anomalous association. Which of its various sections am I to take as my standard of orthodoxy?—In satisfying one, can I expect to satisfy another?—How again am I to satisfy those of the number, who, not having any very distinctive marks of religious profession, dissented from my views through ignorance of the matters on which they pronounced an opinion,—some of them deficient in the requisite erudition and skill for examining the points discussed, and some unhappily also under the irritation of unpleasant feelings?—It is also well known, that among the prime movers of the disburbance were the leaders and disciples of a new theological school, which is now attracting notice by its extraordinary publications, and exciting considerable alarm in the Church. Am I to satisfy this party? Am I to purchase exemption from censure, by folding my arms, and suffering myself to be led away captive by a band, whom I regard as making inroads on the constitution of the Church of England? You would not, my lord, have me consent to such terms of peace. There may be persons disposed to look with indulgence at the excesses of

this party,—who think they are useful as checks to ultraism on the opposite side,—who estimate them on the principle that excess is better than defect,—who would cherish their heat that it may stimulate the lukewarmness of others,—who hope that their extravagance may bring up others to the due measure of zeal. For my part, I cannot accede to such views; for they are not borne out by experience of the effects of ultraism. Nor can I flatter, or encourage in any way, what I conceive to be wrong in principle. If, indeed, the price of quiet is to be a surrender of the name and principles of Protestantism,—if I am to admit the authority of Tradition on a parity with Scripture,—if the profession of Justification by Faith only, is no longer to be the sign of a standing Church, but a doctrine of Episcopal Grace and Sacramental Justification is to overlay God's free pardon through Christ to sinful men,—if private judgment is to be restrained, not by appeal to Scripture and argument, but by intimidation,—if self-constituted associations and the names of men are to rule questions of theology,—if dissent is to be called sin,—and taking of oaths, piety,—and mysticism, religion,—and superstition, faith,—and Antichrist, Christ,—then is there no alternative but that I must be objected against, by those who hold what, if I read the Gospel aright, are most serious perversions of its truth and its spirit:—then must I freely *confess, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the Law and the Prophets.*

CHAPTER X.

UNIVERSITY REFORM—LETTERS TO MR. W. W. HULL—CATHEDRAL STALLS—PROPOSAL TO REPEAL THE 'SELECT PREACHERS' STATUTE—THE PROPOSAL REJECTED—QUESTION RAISED BY MR. MACMULLEN—MR. WARD'S CASE—LETTERS TO MR. W. W. HULL—THE GRANT TO MAYNOOTH—LETTER TO MR. W. W. HULL—REPRESENTATION OF THE UNIVERSITY—DR. HAMPDEN'S 'UNIVERSITY SERMONS.'

Dr. Hampden now entered regularly on the duties of his office, and enjoyed a comparative calm—not indeed unbroken, as here and there some angry spark would fly into the air in proof that if the fire was low it still survived. At the same time he had great satisfaction in the work itself. It was thoroughly congenial to him, and it may be that he threw himself more completely into it from the fact that his social life at Oxford must have been much less pleasant to him than it had been formerly.

He was anxious to see some step taken towards the reform of the University system. For some time he hoped to see Oxford take the initiative; but a longer experience showed him how fruitless this expectation must be: party feeling was too strong to allow men to act together harmoniously for the common good; and he therefore desired to see the Government take the matter actively in hand, as proved to be the case at no very distant period.

Dr. Hampden to Mr. W. W. Hull.

My wishes for the good of Alma Mater (he says in a letter) would in themselves carry me to the greatest extremity of compulsion, as there is so much in the University that wants entire reform, and the existence of which is the perversion of

perhaps the noblest institution in the world. And this crisis may present the opportunity of at least commencing such a reform. But at the same time I would deal with her as an old lady for whom, in common with you, I have a great affection amidst all her faults and incivilities. What, then, do you think should be done in order to open the question in the most proper way, and the way most likely to lead to a satisfactory termination? . . . . I shall make allowance, of course, for some 'good old Tory feeling' on your part coming in at this stage of the question; but I shall take your advice as I know it is given, and endeavour to profit by it.

Again, to the same friend he writes:—

It is very probable, I think, that a Commission will be issued from the Crown for visiting the University. It seems to be generally expected here, though they are sweeping away and making a sound of putting things to rights, hoping that the note of preparation may avert, or at least delay, the visitation. The University is now following Ovid's advice—

Et si nullus erit pulvis, tamen excute nullum.

They have found this officiousness in the small way, useful on former occasions for directing public attention from the real dust and the real cobwebs. I trust, for my part, it will not avail, and that we shall have a strenuous, effective Commission for reforming the University. But do not suppose, at the same time, that I am too sanguine about it. . . I should rather see our Alma Mater show herself more of a Niobe than a Medusa—all tears, rather than all serpents—but if she is in love with her own deformity, what is to be done with her?

If not reform, there was some improvement in 1842, when an addition was made to the professorial staff by the appointment of two new professors—one of Ecclesiastical History, and one of Pastoral Theology. This was a provision of the Cathedrals Bill: the Cathedral staff at Christ Church was not diminished in numbers, but the two professorships were created and stalls in the Cathedral

attached to them. Dr. Hampden always regretted the diminution of the cathedral stalls, and thought that if the poorer parishes that exist in so many cathedral towns had been attached to them instead, a better arrangement would have been made. 'I am happy, however,' he writes, 'in the midst of my concern on this subject, to find that Christ Church is to be kept entire. The two new professorships (of Ecclesiastical History and Biblical Criticism) are just what I wished.'

A Board of Examiners in Theology was now established in the University, with the Regius Professor at its head. By this step the University placed itself in a somewhat anomalous position; for the same authority which had framed one statute to exclude the Regius Professor of Divinity from passing judgment on the orthodoxy of 'Select Preachers,' had by another statute placed him at the head of the Examiners in Divinity. The Heads of Houses seem to have felt, if not the injustice, at least the absurdity of the position in which the University was placed; and they proposed almost unanimously to Convocation to repeal the statute of 1836.*

The proposal failed in its immediate object: too much personal feeling had been called into action at the time when the objectionable statute was first brought before Convocation; so that, in spite of the position in which two such contradictory statutes placed the University, they refused to repeal it, though on this occasion the opposing party appeared with greatly diminished numbers, many publicly declaring a change of opinion. The efforts of the Tractarian party were combined and indefatigable. Dr. Hampden refused, as he had always refused, his consent to any united effort on the part of his friends. One instance has been told of a member of Convocation, who had announced a change of opinion in favour of the Professor to a friend, who, having used every

* See the Letter of Dean Cranmer, p. 141.

argument in his power to bring him back to his former opinion, and failing to do so, exclaimed, 'But you will *stultify yourself*!' to which the other replied, 'Well, then, I *will* stultify myself.'

Of his own position in the University at this time—where he had held his office for six years—Dr. Hampden thus speaks: 'I have formed no party around me. I have not studied to proselytise any. I have stood alone, except so far as my teaching might associate me with other members of our common faith and common Church. Look to those by whom I am opposed. There you see a compact body, understanding each other, ready to act with each other, to join their names and their hands at the first signal from their leaders. Look to my case, on the other hand. I make no boast of it; for I have only acted in a way which my feelings as well as my duty have led me. I have quietly gone about the functions of my office. Some may say I have been comparatively silent in it. But I have not been silent *in my place*. Nor have I shrunk from the labour and responsibility of publishing what I thought proper from time to time. But I have formed no party. I have given no name to any followers. Then, I pray you, test me by this criterion, and test my adversaries too. And you will then readily discern who are the disturbers of the peace of the Church —who are the innovators—who are the persons to be suspected and feared.' *

One of the duties of the Regius Professor of Divinity is to present candidates to Convocation for Divinity degrees, after having satisfied himself of their fitness, by a form generally prescribed by the statutes, and regulated in detail by the Professor. Two 'exercises' or 'disputations,' as they are called, were read by the candidate in the Divinity School, the Regius Professor presiding. It was the practice of Dr. Hampden, as well as of his predecessor

* *Lecture on Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 44.

Dr. Burton, to give the subjects on which the disputations were to be made.

In the course of the year 1842 Mr. Macmullen, a Fellow of Corpus Christi College, wished to offer himself as a candidate for the degree of Bachelor in Divinity. He called on the Professor and requested to have subjects for the exercises sent to him, which was accordingly done. On receiving them, Mr. Macmullen requested to have them changed for others, which he should himself choose, and furthermore acquainted Dr. Hampden, with a truthfulness that was highly to his credit, that he 'felt at once how exceedingly difficult and painful it would be for him to dispute upon them.' By his statement of dislike to the subjects proposed to him, Mr. Macmullen stood before the Professor no longer as an ordinary candidate for a Divinity degree, but as a person to whom certain doctrines of the Church of England were 'painful.' There was a correspondence of some length. Mr. Macmullen eventually made a claim to choose for himself, without consulting the will of the Professor, the subjects for the disputations which he intended to make, and to compel the Professor to attend, even though he might disapprove of the subjects so chosen. This claim Dr. Hampden resisted. It seemed to him to be contrary to the purpose of the institution that the moderator should be subject to the will of the candidate, and should be without power to control the proceedings. He therefore refused to attend, and the degree was delayed; Mr. Macmullen suffered loss in respect of a fellowship, and brought an action against the Regius Professor of Divinity in order to be indemnified. In the Vice-Chancellor's Court it was held that the suit might be maintained; but upon appeal to the Court of Delegates the judgment of the Vice-Chancellor's Court was reversed, and it was held that Mr. Macmullen's claim for damages could not be maintained, and his action accordingly

failed.* In a subsequent letter to the Professor, Mr. Macmullen said: 'Having failed in my endeavour to obtain that redress in the subject of our late disagreement to which I think myself entitled, I am prepared now to write upon the subjects you imposed upon me last year.'

In 1844-5, when Mr. Ward's book, 'The Ideal of the Christian Church,' came under the censure of the University, the following mention of the subject occurs in a letter to Mr. Hull:—

Dr. Hampden to Mr. W. W. Hull.

On studying over the paper issued from the Hebdomadal Board you will see, I think, that it carefully avoids proposing any *theological opinions* or statements to the judgment of Convocation. Had this not been the case, I should certainly not have supported the measure, nor would Dr. Hawkins, I believe. For one can sufficiently see, even without the palpable experience of 1836, that Convocation is not a competent tribunal for questions of doctrine, or what opinions are, or are not, consonant with the Articles. There are better tribunals for such questions in the University itself (for example, the Vice-Chancellor in himself as Ordinary, or the Vice-Chancellor in his Court, or a board of Doctors). But where a plain question of *morality* is concerned, and the infraction of a plain University statute (that requires subscription, and of course a *bonâ fide* subscription, to the Articles), this is a matter of fact, of which every member of Convocation is able to judge at once, on the *primâ facie* aspect of the case. Mr. Ward must be regarded as a person who has *cancelled* his subscription, and then justifies, or attempts to justify, his continuing to enjoy privileges attached to honest subscription. . . Pray, therefore, reconsider your vote, and avoid the chance of giving even indirect encouragement to this 'unprincipled heresy,' as the Bishop of Llandaff rightly terms it. I have had some corre-

* The effect of the legal proceedings is here stated according to an account of them by Sir William Erle, who was counsel with Dr. Hampden in the case. The report of Hampden *v.* Macmullen will be found in *Notes of Cases in the Ecclesiastical and Maritime Courts*, vol. iii., Supplement, p. i.

spondence with —— on the subject; and, jealous as he rightly is of the power of Convocation, he still admits that it may condemn the act of dishonest subscription, provided its condemnation is restricted to this point, and does not intrude on the province of opinion. The proposed measure appears to me to keep within these limits.

A little later on he writes to the same friend:—

I sent you a pamphlet from which I trust you will obtain some satisfaction on Ward's case. I greatly regret to find you among the dissentients, for I am sure you have weighed the question most conscientiously, and it concerns me that we should differ on a point where we ought naturally to agree; for you acted in 1836 on the ground on which you now declare your intention of acting in Mr. Ward's case. Really, however, as it appears to me, the cases are quite distinct in their grounds. It is no question whether Mr. Ward is Arian, Sabellian, Athanasian, Transubstantiationist, Calvinist, Arminian, or what not; but whether he should be allowed to trample on the Articles and set an example of eluding the use of them as tests of a teacher of the *Church of England* doctrine in the University, by equivocation. No one positive statement of doctrine by Mr. Ward is alleged in the passages cited. No one need read his book to know what he believes, or does not believe, in the matter of doctrine. It is enough that he declares that he subscribes the Articles in a sense consistent with Romanism. Whatever may be the *latitude* attributed to the Articles, the agreement with Romanism is clearly not an open question with them. And as for signing, and then explaining away your signature, what honest, unsophisticated mind is not a competent judge of such iniquity? I conceive, therefore, that Mr. Ward's case is one that may fairly and reasonably come before a Convocation, though it may be the fact that nineteen-twentieths of the body may be very ignorant men and improper judges of what is sound or not in doctrine.

When the question of the Grant to Maynooth was under the consideration of Parliament, an inquiry was made of Dr. Hampden, whether any petition would be

sent from the University against the grant, to which he replied: 'There will be *no* petition from the University against Maynooth. A wish has been expressed by several persons here for such a petition; but the Board has determined to be silent. I heard the words "too late" last Monday; but I suspect the real reason of silence is a fear of adding to the embarrassment of the Government, and perhaps some little fear of annoying the Duke of Wellington, who will not brook the slightest opposition to his wishes. If you intend to move, therefore, you must set to work in London, as you must expect no help here. For my part, I have never joined in any petition bearing on a political question, and cannot therefore be of use to you *in propriâ personâ*. But I should have gladly concurred in a corporate petition, had such been proposed at the Board, and I can wish you all success in your proceeding, which I fear you will say is but cold support.' Again, on this subject he writes: 'I am only astonished that a Government calling itself Conservative or Tory, or *quocunque nomine* of self-estimation, could have ventured on such a Bill. The difference obviously is immense between a grant of civil privileges and a grant of money for endowing or educating Roman Catholic priests. But I hope there is a power of resistance yet in the country sufficient to counteract this despotic proceeding of the Government. What a tyranny an absolute majority, such as we now see in the House of Commons, may really become, especially with our military dictator sitting supreme in the Cabinet!'

On the subject of the election in 1847 of Members of Parliament for the University of Oxford, he writes: 'I should be glad to see such a man as Lord Morpeth, who has strongly declared himself against Tractarianism, or Sir George Grey, brought forward; or, if a Whig is objectionable, such a man as Sir Thomas Acland or Lord Ashley. It ought not to be a place for a young man to

rise from, but for one who has already risen, and will regard it as an honour and trust for the rest of his life. It is probable that Mr. Cardwell's Maynooth vote will weigh against him with the majority of the country clergy, and some will say: "If we are to have Sir R. Peel's man, why not Sir R. Peel himself?" I shall at any rate vote for Sir R. Inglis, as I should regard it an ungrateful thing to turn out one who has so zealously served the University.'

Both as Regius Professor and as Canon of Christ Church, Dr. Hampden was frequently called on to preach the 'University Sermon.' Members of the different colleges attend divine service in the chapels of their colleges; the University meet together for the 'University Sermon.' Whenever he preached, the cathedral was crowded. Whatever discouragement and annoyance he met with at other times, he never encountered such in the discharge of his public duty. On the contrary, on these and other occasions he received the greatest respect and attention, which were the more openly manifested, probably, from a generosity of feeling prompted by the violence with which his appointment had been assailed. Several of his 'University Sermons' were published singly, and had a rapid circulation, reaching to many editions. They were subsequently (in 1848) collected in a volume, in compliance with a request made to him to that effect. There are many who have borne witness to the instruction and comfort they have derived from these sermons in moments of trial and doubt. 'They are,' their author says in a notice at the beginning of the volume, 'closely connected in their bearing on points recently (1848) brought into prominent discussion.'

The peculiar views of the Tractarian party were especially forced on public attention at this time, when they were rising into importance as an organised sect. And, adverse as he was to controversy, the heavy responsibility

that rested on him, as the head of the theological teaching in the University, obliged him to break the silence that would have been more congenial to his personal feelings, and to point out to his hearers the dangerous character of the views put forth in the publications of this party. 'For,' he says, 'we of such a place as this being for the most part devoted, beyond most other Christians, to the study and exposition of God's Word—of us, our Lord especially asks the question, "What think ye of Christ?"' *

Although any criticism of these sermons would be out of place here, yet the tone and temper in which he approached discussions that had been the occasion of so much heat, and so many angry words, seem to belong to his more personal history, with which these pages are especially concerned. A passage in the Fourth Sermon (entitled 'The One Sacrifice for Sin') may serve as an example. 'We must beware,' he says, 'lest the truth, associated with error, incline us to indulgence to that error. . . . I lay the more stress on this, because there seems a disposition in these times to dwell on the fact that the Church of Rome is a *true* Church—true in its profession of the fundamental truths of the Gospel, and its inheritance of an Apostolic commission,—and to speak with indulgence and extenuation of its gross corruptions. God forbid that we should speak of any individual members of that Church but with the charity of brethren, and with that respect which is due to many of them for their conscientious profession of its system, and whose exemplary devotion and faithful Christian walk may be a shame to many who profess a purer faith. It is the theory or system of the Church to which I refer, and that system, not so much as it is actually professed by its own members, but as it may be indulgently regarded by others not of their communion.

* Sermon I., p. 14.

Admitting, as we do, that the Church of Rome is in its origin a true Church, it is the more necessary, to keep us in allegiance to our own particular Church, that we should protest at the same time most strenuously against those corruptions, which might otherwise too fatally recommend themselves, as parts of the profession of a Church confessedly Apostolic in its origin. There is a disposition, too, to regard superstition as comparatively harmless; a notion which, if generally prevalent, would soon prepare the way for a return to the errors of Rome. Persons compare superstition with the evil of positive unbelief. From such comparison they would lead us to infer that, as superstition may be better than unbelief, superstition itself may be tolerated in the practice of the Christian. . . . Both are to be guarded against, and both at the same time; for they appear each to bring the other after it in its train. Superstition is commonly found attended with unbelief, even in the same mind. And unbelief is just that state of mind which, if alarmed into some low sense of religion, takes the form of wild and trembling superstition. We must not think, then, that we are at least on the safe side, when we add to the Gospel errors, of which the excuse is, that the utmost to be said in their condemnation is that they are superstitious. It is no slight condemnation of them that they are superstitious. It is no insignificant intimation that they do not belong to the Gospel of Christ.'*

In another place he gives an earnest warning against the evils naturally resulting from raising into undue importance, by agitation, questions relating to ceremonies and rubrical direction, as if they were matters of vital importance. 'It is not,' he says, 'like the contest about the use of the surplice at the time of the Reformation, when the people were necessarily called to the consideration of what should be retained, or what discarded, of

* Sermon IV., p. 192.

those things which had been associated with the corruptions of the faith. The vestment controversy was then forced on people's minds, and was far from unreasonable at that time; though too great importance was attributed to it even then. But now that the minds of members of the Church at large are settled on this point,—now that the decent ceremonial of the Church is held in just esteem, nay, cherished, by the chief part of its members with strong feelings of attachment—an attachment confirmed by their experience of its tendency to edification—it must surely be most unwise to raise so unnecessary a controversy,—to disturb a feeling of wise and happy contentment, but which, when once roused from its quiescence, will not be easily quelled, nor perhaps until it has spent itself in acts of destruction which the movers of the storm would deprecate too late. But what I am chiefly remarking here is the evil itself of unsettling the minds of the people on these matters,—leading them to think that *these* must be much more important things *in religion* than they have been accustomed to think them; and perplexing them with doubtful disputations; turning their attention, for the time at least, from the substance of the faith to the externals—from the things indispensable to salvation to things indifferent—from the service of the heart to the service of the body.'*

* Sermon X., p. 349.

CHAPTER XI.

LIFE AT EWELME—INTERCOURSE WITH PARISHIONERS—DISSENT—EWELME CHURCH—RECREATIONS—LETTER TO HIS ELDEST SON—LETTERS TO THE REV. W. HAYWARD COX—ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF CHALGROVE FIELD—DEPARTURE FROM EWELME—ADDRESS FROM PARISHIONERS, AND REPLY.

THE portion of time spent by Dr. Hampden at Ewelme (the living attached to the Regius Professorship of Divinity) was perhaps the happiest of his life. There his intercourse with his parishioners, both rich and poor, and with his neighbours, was a long summer-day of goodwill and kindly feeling. He was at the same time their leader and fellow-worker: meeting hand to hand, they 'walked together in the house of God as friends.' They felt his perfect sincerity in all his dealings with them: formal, 'cut-and-dry' phrases were never used by him in his conversations with them. He was respectful to all, more especially the poorest, and never 'patronised' any. Consequently, there was between his poorer parishioners and their Rector none of the cold, distant feeling which so often separates the educated from the less educated classes. In sickness and sorrow it was his gentle voice that led, with the earnestness of true sympathy, the failing accents of those endeavouring to say aloud the latest prayer.

As he passed on his way down the village every one would greet him, and many a 'Just step in, sir,' was the prelude to some long story of family history, told to him with the full confidence of his being an interested listener. And he really was so: not only because he felt it his duty to listen to and understand the narrators as his parishioners, but because also, as an acute observer of

human nature, he was really interested, and no true touch of feeling escaped his notice. How he found out 'all about it' often puzzled his parishioners. In this manner subjects were suggested to him for instruction both in the church and the school, and frequently also at the rectory; for there all were sure to find a welcome, and could count on help and sympathy in their difficulties. Even the older people, who found 'writing hard to read,' would go to him to have their family letters read to them.

He strongly objected to what is known as 'proselytising.' But instances were not wanting of Wesleyans, Independents, Baptists, and others, who came within the influence of his teaching, renouncing Dissent of their own accord, and becoming Church-people and regular attendants on the services of the parish church. On one occasion he was asked to christen a family of five little children. The father was a Baptist, and came to church in the first instance chiefly to 'see what was going on.' After a while he called on the rector, and announced his change of opinion, and his desire to bring up his children as Church-people. Another instance occurred of a small tradesman who used to be rather a favourite preacher at the Independent chapel, and who came to church to 'get up' his sermon for the evening. This he explained to Dr. Hampden, adding, 'That was a very good sermon you gave us this morning; I gave it to them in the chapel in the evening.' Not long after, this man gave up his preaching, and left the chapel and became a constant and zealous Churchman.

To give some idea of the way in which he often found the subjects for his sermons, one of them—and one full of instruction—was suggested to him by a conversation he overheard between Mrs. Hampden and a poor woman, on whose blunted intelligence she was endeavouring vainly to impress a sense of the wickedness of some act she had committed. At last, appealing to her sole redeeming virtue,

her honesty, she said, 'If your child was to steal, what would you say to that?' 'Oh! and wouldn't I wallop her!' 'But why?' 'Why! she to go and take what isn't her'n!' The sermon was on the 'Sinfulness of Sin.'

The parish of Ewelme * had been well cared for, and more especially so by his predecessor, Dr. Burton; still, as in all great work, the more that has been done, the larger the opening for increased exertion. In each path of pastoral duty he set a firm and forward foot. The schools were raised to greater efficiency, and received much of his personal attention; the plan for the day's work, apportioned to the different classes, still remains in his own handwriting. He laid great stress on the advantage of the children's learning by heart psalms and hymns and other simple poetry, not only on account of the instruction and comfort they would derive in after-years from this store, but also as an exercise of memory: this he thought was not sufficiently considered in village school teaching at that time. He instituted a night school for boys and young men who were at work during the day. One of the churchwardens, a yeoman farmer, who took at that time, and still takes, a warm interest in this school, says, in speaking of it, as it is now carried on: 'The evening school is also kept on, just the same as when it was my privilege to meet dear Dr. Hampden coming down to it through the old cloisters, with his little lantern, in the dark evenings of winter.'

In one respect the parish of Ewelme was especially fortunate. The farmers were men who fully recognised their duty as employers of labour, and were anxious that

* The name 'Ewelme' is said, although not on very certain authority, to be derived from two Saxon words signifying 'Water-head,' or 'Spring-head.' Such a derivation might be accounted for by the fact that the clearest and brightest of brooks takes its rise in the village, and continues its rippling course on one side, the whole length of the village street. It is justly regarded with pride by the inhabitants, who declare that the watercresses growing in the brook were so famous, that at one time 'Ewelme watercresses' were cried in London streets.

the children of their workpeople should attend the school, they themselves also taking part in it personally, as well as assisting it by their subscriptions; and they further set a good example in the parish by their regular attendance at church and by their conduct in their own families. Dr. Hampden justly esteemed them highly.

He took especial pride and delight in the parish church of Ewelme—a beautiful Gothic church, rebuilt in the fifteenth century by Geoffrey Chaucer's granddaughter, Alice, Duchess of Suffolk, to whose memory there is a fine alabaster monument in the chancel.* From the west end

* An account given in the Hon. and Rev. H. A. Napier's *Historical Notices of Swyncombe and Ewelme*, quoted from Joseph Clarke, F.S.A., may be of interest: 'On the south side of the church of St. Mary at Ewelme, in an opening between the chancel and St. John's Chapel, close adjoining to and at right angles with the communion table, is a large, high tomb of alabaster, to Alice, Duchess of Suffolk. Over it is a canopy of pannelled stone, ranged on the cornice of which, on either side, are nine figures, apparently angels, and beatified ecclesiastics, alternately. There are four pinnacles, one rising between each third figure, bearing on the top little images carved in oak, two on each side being winged, the others in ecclesiastical habits. The cornice is pannelled, and crested with the Tudor ornament. Between the upper and lower piers, which are pannelled in stone, similar to the canopy they support, is the tomb, on which lies a full-sized figure of the Duchess. She wears the kirtle, over which is a loose gown, and above all the mantle of estate, fastened at the throat by cords with tassels; round her neck, and over the chin, is the wimple. A ducal coronet confines a veil, which falls over the shoulders; a ring is on the third finger of the right hand; on the left arm, a little above the wrist, is the Garter; and a rosary is at her right side. At her feet, and resting on it, is a lion. Two angels, each having four wings, support on each side the cushion under her head; over them and the head of the duchess, is a flat canopy, which is highly relieved, and richly carved. The small figure of an angel at each of the upper corners of the slab bears a shield, with the Roet and Burghersh arms; and along the edge of the slab is a square rod, or staff, crocketted and finialled, let into the outer edge of which is the following inscription on brass: "Orate pro anima serenissimæ Principissæ Aliciæ Ducissæ Suffolciæ hujus Ecclesiæ Patronæ, et primæ Fundatricis hujus Eleemosynariæ quæ obiit xx. die mensis Maii anno 1475." The upper part of the tomb is divided on each side into eight compartments. An additional one, through some cause or other, appears on both sides to have been left out from the original design; as between the two last compartments to the east is a jointure in the stone, and the divisional buttress between each of the other divisions, is here repeated twice. The niches contain, on little brackets, alternately a male and female winged figure, each of which bears a shield

of the church there is a covered Gothic archway, with a flight of steps that lead to the cloistered quadrangle of an almshouse for thirteen old men, founded by the same pious lady with the consent of King Henry VI. The church is built of stone, of a soft grey colour, and flint, the union of which, unlikely as it may seem, is rendered still more harmonious in colour by some repairs done long ago in red brick. Dr. Burton, the former Regius Professor and rector, had done a great deal for the improvement of the interior, and Dr. Hampden continued the restoration and decoration. The churchyard has its row of fine elms, in which the rooks are well 'at home.'

All his vacations were spent at Ewelme, his chief recreations being gardening (in which he always delighted), planning alterations, planting, and pruning; and when too busy to allow himself leisure for these occupations, he would establish himself with his books, his ink-bottle and pen, under the shade of the trees, in preference to his study. He enjoyed being in the open air, especially in the early morning.

He always spent as much time at Ewelme as his Oxford duties would allow, sometimes making out the time by an early start at six in the morning, riding into Oxford in time for some Divinity degree or other business. He

having arms. At the east and west end of the tomb are two similar compartments, but defaced, being close to the piers. The lower division is of open tracery in pannels, corresponding with the niches above, and the same irregularity occurs in their adjustment: within is seen the emaciated figure of the Duchess in death, in her shroud. The ceiling over the figure is partially painted in water-colours, the subject at the west end being the Annunciation. Above the feet of the upper figure of the Duchess, against the side of the pier, is a bracket to hold lights. The whole monument is in a most splendid state of preservation. The length of the tomb is eight feet by ten; width, three feet by one; and the height, from the raised floor of St. John's Chapel, is four feet by seven.'—(*Historical Notices, &c.*, p. 102.)

Ewelme has been the scene of many historical incidents; amongst others, it is recorded that King Henry VIII., soon after his marriage with Katherine Howard, being on a progress, visited Ewelme, where a Privy Council was held on August 25 and 26, 1540.—Nicolas's *Proceedings of the Privy Council*, vol. vii. pp. 10, 12, quoted by Napier, p. 205.

was always accompanied in these early rides by one or more of his children. They took a cross road through the village of Pyrton that led to Chiselhampton Common, over which he greatly enjoyed a brisk canter, as well as over Cowley Marsh (which was then uninclosed), and so to Oxford. In the summer evenings, when he could spare the time, a long ride over the Ewelme and Swyncombe Downs 'set him up' both in health and spirits.

Something of the cheerfulness of his life at Ewelme may be gleaned from a letter written to his eldest son, who was then at Eton :—

Dr. Hampden to his eldest son.

Ewelme, July 15, 1840.

My dear Edd,—As but a few days remain before we shall have the pleasure of seeing you home again, I must make haste to save my credit by writing you a letter. I wrote at last, you find, my promised letter to Mr. Durnford; but it was certainly 'long a coming.' I was reminded of its being due by the good report which he sent of you. You say it is nothing more than you deserved. It is to be hoped this will prove the case, and we shall find you quite the scholar when you come back. We shall allow you a little holiday at first, and then we shall set to, and see what you can do to astonish us. I told Mr. Durnford that I wished you to do some mathematics when you returned next half, and that we would try therefore to make some way in Euclid in the vacation. We must have a railroad over the Asses' Bridge, and get up the steam well, and we may then, perhaps, get over it. Mamma and Henrietta want sadly to go to Eton on Saturday the 25th; but I do not see how they can manage it; I ask them why they should wish so much to go there, when you will be coming home *only the* Monday following, particularly as the approaching election concerns the collegers only. I do not think I can conveniently come, it being the day before Sunday. I was glad to hear you had been breakfasting with Dr. Hawtrey and met Mr. Senior. You might have amused us with some account of your party. I suppose you were much envied for the great

distinction of breakfasting with the head-master. Mamma wrote to you all about your invitation to Marlow. We were glad you did not wish to go, because we did not wish it, and in general we should not like your going out anywhere beyond Windsor—without meaning any unkindness to the friends who are so good as to invite you. We are expecting all the little Lovells here to-morrow with their mother to spend a few days before they go to school. They will be gone before you come back. We have got a magpie, however, to amuse you, as it talks as well as any human being. We shall not take up your pony until you are here to see about it. At present Charley's Forester is occupying your stall; but Glanville is at work fitting up a stall in the coach-house. Did you get your basket of 'sock,' and everything in it safely? When you come by the railroad, you must take your place to the Moulsford Station, the place to which we rode together, and we will have a horse there, with ourselves, ready to meet you. All send their love; Granny is better, and says she longs to see you again.

I am, my dear Edd, your affectionate papa,

R. D. HAMPDEN.

The two following letters, written from Ewelme, are also quoted:—

Dr. Hampden to the Rev. W. Hayward Cox.

Ewelme, September 10, 1838.

I ought to begin with a quantity of apologies for suffering this letter to be so long due. None, however, can state so fully my concern at my seeming neglect, as my simply saying that 'I do feel sorry for it!' You will, I am sure, have thrown the blame on my sundry unavoidable engagements from time to time, added to my standing engagement on the Plato. The Plato, however, I have at last finished, and it is all in the hands of the printers—about half, indeed, already printed and done with; and the remaining half or more to come back to me in a few days for correction, when I hope to have quite done with it. It was too short a time for writing even a brief account of so large a subject, one extending, indeed, over the whole realm of thought. But it must go for what it is worth.

You will be amused, I daresay, and others will be a little annoyed, at some passages in which you or they may suspect that I have given some sketches from Oxford.

The Oxford New Mania in itself has excited considerable alarm, but it wants to be tied in a Mezentian knot with the old high-churchism of —— and —— and *id genus omne*, or farrago rather. The old leaven would detach itself from the new fermentation. This is one of the tricks of party, as the Archbishop of Dublin has well pointed out in his Charge just published; it is the policy of some of the greatest 'malignants' to claim independence for themselves, while they are working all the while in the omnibus of the company. No man looks more independent than the impudent fellow on the hind step of the omnibus, but he works the machine no less than the more respectable driver. By-the-bye, you should read the Charge of the Archbishop of Dublin; it is well-timed, and I hope will tell. I attended a Bible Society meeting at Thame on Monday last. I took the opportunity in my speech from the chair, of referring to the state of religious knowledge now, and dwelt on the necessity of meeting the errors of the traditionists and substituters of the Fathers for the Scriptures. All that I said was well received, and echoed by several of the speakers after me. An agent of the society spoke of his having read the account of the persecutions, in 'a foreign land,' and the gratification he had at meeting me there, after 'that outpouring of malice.' I attended the Visitation of the Bishop of Oxford at Henley. The Bishop alluded to the 'Tracts for the Times,' but in such a slight way as to do the new-maniacs more good than harm. However, you see his Charge is to be published. I was *not* one of the clergy that asked him to publish it. Are you not glad to see that Richards is elected Rector of Exeter, and not that namby-pamby ——? But I am really very sorry that good old Jones is gone; we may say with Philoctetes that the best always go first.

Ewelme Rectory, August 27, 1841.

We have been stationary here as usual—with the exception of nearly a week's interval, when I was called upon by Dr. Jelf's absence to take the cathedral duty at Christ Church, much, as you will believe, against my good-will. You have continued,

we hope, to enjoy yourselves at Bonn and its neighbourhood. Things, as you observe, have gone all wrong since you have been away. By this time, I suppose, the Whigs are out of office, or all but out of office. The stupid people never sent me the paper this morning, so that I do not know whether the debate on the Address in the Commons was adjourned or no. From Wednesday evening's paper it appeared that the Lords had carried the amendment by a majority of seventy-six against Ministers, but that the debate in the Commons was adjourned over that night. Ministers of course will try to keep up the debate there, that they may develop the policy both of themselves and of their opponents; but the Opposition will have it in their power to stop the adjournment, and Sir R. Peel, acting under the generalship of the old Duke, seems determined to press his victory as hard as he can upon them. For my part I cannot but think that the present Tory majority is a very hollow one; it is entirely a *money* one, the result of extraordinary effort stimulated by long frustration of eager hopes, and got up on one point of supreme interest to the legislators themselves, against the feelings and *apparent* interest of the majority of the people at large. How can it stand therefore? Then there are the Tory divisions among themselves. I was glad to see —— in apologising for his turn-coaterie, saying, that those who now brought in the new Government would as soon turn them out if they came forward with the proposal of a *fixed* duty. And the Whigs, no longer leaning on the false support of their opponents, the Duke and others, will be much stronger in opposition, and prepare the way for a stronger Whig Government at a future day. The only uneasy question is, How long will that futurity be?

You will have been gratified, in spite of other disappointments, to hear that Arnold is appointed Regius Professor of Modern History in Dr. Nares's place. I hear that Lord Melbourne offered him the appointment in testimony of respect and esteem for him. It is quite right that he should have done so. It is a capital thing, too, against the new sect. A few of his lectures on the times of the Reformation, or the Rebellion, or the Revolution, will carry no little consternation into the Tractarian camp. I should have been very happy for our friend —— to have succeeded in getting the post, as I thought

very probable at one time, as I had no idea of Arnold's taking it; but Arnold, of course, is the best man they could have thought of. —— and ——, both good men, would also have liked it.

You will not come back, I suppose, till the middle of next month, if then. Tell Mrs. Cox we are preparing for an oratorio at Ewelme, at which we shall be glad to see her if she will come back in time. We are trying to get the best singers. All this, however, you will not care about; it is for the edification of your wife. It is now fine, warm, harvest weather with us at last. But we have had on the whole a most disagreeable summer as yet.

I was interested by your mention of the German Professors whom you had seen, and shall be glad to hear any further particulars about them. I hope your German sufficed you to give them a fair understanding of the state of theology and theological feuds at Oxford.

On June 18, 1843, he took part in the commemoration of the two-hundredth anniversary of the Battle of Chalgrove Field, the scene of which was only a few miles distant from Ewelme. There John Hampden received his death-wound. A memorial was erected from the subscriptions of Lord Nugent, Dr. Hampden, Mr. John Hampden, and others, who from family connection or political sympathy were especially interested in such an occasion.

In Dr. Hampden's speech at this meeting he held up the great example which Hampden had set by the spirit in which he contended for civil and religious liberty. 'It was not the fiery spirit, it was not the spirit of opposition or mere violence, which might itself be tyrannical even in resisting tyranny, but the spirit of a just, a good, as well as a great man, which his conduct held forth as an example to all. He was not only a great man in the worldly sense of the term, but a truly good and religious man. It was his delight not only to appear in the field, and to show himself the bravest of soldiers, as that field of Chalgrove, and many other fields could testify, but

like another Miltiades standing on the field of Marathon, though not unhappily with the same success, but with the same determined spirit, and the same bold open courage, to resist the despoilers of his country. Though he was the bravest of soldiers, this was not his highest recommendation: he was equally distinguished in the duties of domestic and social life. He was happy in his own family; happy in the circle of his own tenantry; and it was sufficient to read his correspondence with the Eliot family to see the generosity of his heart. They might say he was beloved by all for his virtues, admired by all for the powers of his masculine understanding, and his statesmanlike ability and conduct. Nor should they pass over his attachment to the pure and reformed Church of this country. And one great ground for setting him forth as an example to posterity was his firm attachment to the principles of the Reformed Church of this kingdom. He not only set himself to work to cut away all abuses of the Church, but in his dislike to abuses he did not forego his attachment to its truth and purity. He died, as he had lived, in communion with the Church of England, praying for its welfare, and praying for the welfare of his country.'

In 1847, when Dr. Hampden took leave of his friends and parishioners, it was with a deep feeling of mutual regret. The farewell address presented to him on this occasion says:—

We cannot suffer you to take leave of a parish in which you have been so well known, without some public expression of the feelings of your parishioners towards you. We have viewed with surprise and regret the opposition made in certain quarters to your appointment; and our surprise has been increased by finding that the ostensible cause of that opposition is the opinions you are represented as holding on some of the vital truths of our holy religion. Into the controversial parts of the question, as regards your published works, it would not become

us to enter. But as the great truths of Christianity have formed the ground-work of your teaching and preaching here for so many years, we cannot refrain from thus publicly testifying to the scriptural soundness and simplicity with which those truths have ever been set forth by you. You have ever made the great doctrine of Justification by Faith in the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ, a prominent feature in your preaching. You have laboured to convince your hearers of the depravity of human nature, and the necessity for the renewing and regenerating influence of God's Holy Spirit on the heart. You have endeavoured to explain to us the scriptural view of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, showing how the Divine as well as human nature must have met in the spotless Sacrifice for Sin. His birth, His life, His passion, His death, His resurrection, and His ascension, have formed the constant subjects of your preaching among us; and on these subjects your teaching has been in clear conformity with the doctrines and articles of our Church, while without intolerance you have upheld her claims and asserted her rights. It may be some satisfaction to you to be assured, that if elsewhere your views have been misrepresented, or your meaning perverted, here at least you have not been misunderstood; while your personal kindness on all occasions has endeared you to those whose constant intercourse has given them the best opportunity of knowing and appreciating you. You are called, sir, in the providence of God, to another and a higher, though scarcely a more influential, sphere of duty. New ties will be formed, and new sympathies will spring up around you. But when distance separates you from a spot where we would fain think that some of your happiest days have hitherto been passed, we trust that the kindly feelings with which your memory will ever be regarded by us will be reciprocated by your own heart. Our best wishes for your health and happiness, with our earnest prayers for your success, will attend you in your new and exalted position. As you have 'fed the flock of God' here, so may you 'feed the Church of God' in which you are now called to bear rule; that 'when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, you may receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.'

Dr. Hampden's reply was as follows :—

Christ Church, Oxford, December 28, 1847.

My dearly beloved Parishioners, — Amidst the anxious thoughts of the present moment, the expression of your affection and sympathy has been the greatest comfort to me.

Happy indeed is that parish where so cordial an union of feeling subsists as that which has prompted this your most kind and considerate address. I have not been able to read it without many tears. For it has made me feel throughout that your heart was with my heart. It only speaks indeed the fact, how we have lived together as brethren in Christ, walking in the house of God as friends, and edifying one another in the pure faith of God's Holy Word, and in that charity which is the bond of peace. I bless God, my dear friends, that you join with this memorial of your affection a remembrance of the lessons of Gospel truth which I have sedulously endeavoured, through God's grace, to inculcate on you. Unspeakable indeed will be the blessing both to you and to me, if I shall have left fully and deeply impressed on your hearts the saving doctrines of the Gospel—if this alone shall be chiefly recollected by each of you, that I 'determined' with the Apostle Paul 'not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified;' that I led you to Him, your great God and Saviour, the Lord your Righteousness, for pardon and justification, and for the sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit to enable you to walk worthily of your holy calling and to bring you finally to everlasting life.

The Lord, the Divine Head of the Church, is about, my dear brethren, to send me from you, to labour elsewhere in a wider field of ministerial duty. But never can I expect happier days than those I have spent among you. Greatly indeed have I been indebted for any success that may have attended my ministry in the parish, to yourselves, to that kindness and respect, that support and encouragement, which I have received from you all, and in particular from those possessing influence among you. You have rendered my ministry truly a labour of love by your kindness and confidence. But though absent from you in person, I shall not cease to be with you in spirit. Often shall I be thinking of you, especially at the stated times of public prayer when you will be assembled in our beautiful Church;

then shall I be lifting up my heart with you often in your prayers and hymns of praise, as I have ever delighted to do when present in times past. Often, too, shall I be praying for you. Nor can I doubt that I shall have the help and comfort of your prayers in my behalf. In these especially I would most earnestly desire ever to live in your affectionate remembrance. May, then, the gracious Lord of His infinite mercy bring to perfection the good seed sown in your hearts by His Spirit, and so effectually keep us all in His faith and love, that we may meet hereafter in His more immediate presence, never more to be separated, as one flock in the fold of the one great Shepherd, Jesus Christ our Lord.

Believe me, my dear Christian brethren, your faithfully devoted minister and ever affectionate friend,

R. D. HAMPDEN.

CHAPTER XII.

1847.

APPOINTED BISHOP OF HEREFORD—OPPOSITION TO THE APPOINTMENT—ITS CHARACTER — ARCHDEACON HARE'S 'LETTER TO THE DEAN OF CHICHESTER'—LETTER FROM DEAN CRAMER ON THE PROCEEDINGS IN 1836—PROTEST BY THIRTEEN BISHOPS—LORD JOHN RUSSELL'S REPLY—PROPOSAL TO INSTITUTE A SUIT AGAINST DR. HAMPDEN — CORRESPONDENCE — ADDRESSES OF SYMPATHY.

THE death of the Archbishop of York, and the translation of the Bishop of Hereford to that see in 1847, left vacant the see of Hereford. Lord Russell recommended the Regius Professor of Divinity to Her Majesty, who was pleased to accept the recommendation, and to nominate Dr. Hampden.

No sooner was the appointment made known than an opposition was offered to it—differing in its outward signs, but conducted in like temper to that of 1836. Even some pamphlets written and circulated at that time were republished and distributed again on this occasion.*

It was impossible to bring the subject before the Oxford Convocation, but the same elements were called into action by meetings of the country clergy in their own neighbourhoods. The general character of these meetings may be estimated by the following extract from a published reply to an invitation to attend one of them,

* This was the case with a pamphlet entitled *Elucidations of the Leading Views contained in Dr. Hampden's Bampton Lectures.* The editor has the authority of the author (Dr. Newman) for saying that it was (he believes) republished in 1847 without his knowledge or permission, when he was abroad. To one whose chief acquaintance with Dr. Newman's writings is through the 'Verses on Various Occasions'—verses that fall so gently on the ear and on the heart—it has seemed almost impossible that their author could have taken so perverse, and stranger still, so harsh a view as that contained in this pamphlet, even of opinions that differed most widely from his own.

addressed by Archdeacon Hare to the Dean of Chichester:—

Archdeacon Hare to the Dean of Chichester.

You wrote to me a fortnight ago, to inform me of certain measures which the Chapter of Chichester were about to take with the view of endeavouring to avert the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford; and you seemed to wish that I should propose some similar measure to the clergy in the Archdeaconry of Lewes. When we met two days after in the Convocation, you spoke to me on the same subject. My answer was, that, having never read any of Dr. Hampden's writings, I should feel it my duty beforehand to examine them, especially his Bampton Lectures, which are the main ground of the charges brought against him, in order to make out whether they do indeed contain sufficient reason for doing, what, at all events, must imply a grave condemnation of a person who had for eleven years filled the first theological chair in one of our Universities. Since then I have returned a like answer to similar applications, which have been addrest to me by clergymen in this Archdeaconry. To my surprise, my answer has seemed in some cases to surprise the applicants. Yet what other answer could a person return, who had any sense of the solemn responsibility incurred by such a proceeding, and knew that he was called to do justly, and to love mercy, in all the relations of life, whether private or public? Even after all the experience which half a century has yielded me, of the manner in which men's actions are swayed, not by conscientious principles, but mostly by prejudices taken up almost at hazard, it has astonisht me to see how thousands,—I am afraid I do not exaggerate,—invested with the ministry of the Gospel, the ministry of love and reconciliation, have on this occasion rusht forward with blind, reckless impetuosity, to do what they could to condemn and crush a brother. Surely in such a matter we ought to act cautiously, deliberately, reluctantly. We ought to be slow in admitting a conviction which brands a brother as a heretic, instead of running forward with breathless haste to embrace it.*

* *Letter to the Dean of Chichester*, p. 1.

This letter further contains an examination of the propositions taken from Dr. Hampden's works and submitted to Convocation;—this being, as Archdeacon Hare says, 'the only instance in which the objections have taken a tangible form.' 'They fall,' he continues, 'at the first touch; like a row of card soldiers.'

The Archdeacon had no personal friendship or even acquaintance with Dr. Hampden. This patient investigation was made in the cause, one and the same, of truth and justice. 'Truth,' says a great poet and writer, 'is but justice in our knowledge, and justice is but truth in our practice. . . . Truth is properly no more than contemplation; and her utmost efficiency is but teaching: but justice in her very essence is all strength and activity; and hath a sword put into her hand, to use against all violence and oppression on the earth.'*

The Archdeacon says, in concluding his letter:—

Much zeal has been manifested on this occasion; and zeal in a righteous cause is ever to be honoured. 'It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing.' But zeal without discretion, zeal under the impulses of ignorance, has dragged martyrs to the stake. Does it not prove to us that the same spirit would be no less violent now, if it were not that the changes in outward circumstances and in public opinion bridled it in,—does it not constrain us to hang down our heads in shame,—when we hear of thousands, as it would seem, of our brethren rushing eagerly to protest, to remonstrate, to sign addresses, against Dr. Hampden, while there is scarcely any evidence that a single one among these thousands has thought it his duty to make out carefully and conscientiously how he ought to act, and while it is too plain that hardly any one has studied Dr. Hampden's writings, with the view of forming his decision? In what other class of men could such a thing happen? Would it happen among lawyers? among physicians? among soldiers or sailors? among merchants? *No!* it will be probably replied: *but then the matters they are concerned in are not of such deep, universal*

* Milton, Εἰκονοκλάστης. *Works*, Pickering, 1851, vol. iii. p. 517.

moment, and do not peril our eternal interests. Yet surely this very consideration ought to make us more careful, more cautious, more scrupulous, ought to teach us that, though in other things we may allow ourselves to act on plausible presumptions, yet, in these matters of awful importance, it behoves us to use all our vigilance, to strain every eye of the mind, lest we deliver an unjust, and therefore an ungodly judgment.*

A great deal of capital (so to speak) was made at this time of the vote of the Oxford Convocation of 1836. The best account of that transaction is contained in a letter by Dr. Cramer (Dean of Carlisle and Professor of Modern History at Oxford), who was a member of the Board of Heads of Houses at the time when the vote was first proposed.

Dean Cramer to Dr. Hampden.

Deanery, Carlisle, December 22, 1847.

My dear Dr. Hampden,—When a violent, and, as I firmly believe in your case, an unjust, outcry is attempted to be raised against an innocent individual, it behoves everyone with common feelings of justice and charity, not merely to protest against such a proceeding, but as far as he can to demonstrate its injustice. I am convinced that a most unfair use is now being made against you of the Oxford statute of 1836; and this I affirm more decidedly, because having been myself a party to that transaction, and present at every meeting of the Heads of

* *Letter*, p. 63.

In a short pamphlet entitled *A Few Words on the Hampden Controversy* by the Hon. and Rev. Orlando Forester, M.A., the passages from Dr. Hampden's works, as cited by a writer of several letters in the *Times* (November 20 and 27, 1847), signed 'Presbyter,' are placed side by side with the passages as they stand in the original. This pamphlet is no appeal to party feeling—no defence, as the author says—'otherwise than such defence may result from simply putting forth, for the benefit of every-day and commonplace persons like myself, a representation of the case as it is, as a set-off to the misrepresentation of it.' The letters of 'Presbyter' were also ably answered in the *Times* of November 26 and December 2, by one signing himself 'A late Fellow,' whose name the Bishop never knew. In the temper of this correspondence there is a marked contrast. The former ('Presbyter') appears to have been too angry to be just: the latter too just to be angry.

Houses at that period, I know somewhat more of the scope, intention, and history of the statute than those who so confidently refer to it as a disqualifying measure, and seek to attach it to a degree of censure which it never was meant to express. The whole proceeding was novel, and, to say the least of it, at variance with the forms prescribed by the University statutes on such occasions. It sought in fact by a circuitous and evasive method to affix a censure which would not have been obtained from a more formal and legitimate process. Notwithstanding the skilful tactics then employed, and the most importunate and persevering pressure from a party without, it is well known that the measure was carried through the Board of Heads of Houses with very great difficulty. For my part I shall ever look upon the consent I gave to its being submitted to Convocation, as the most unsatisfactory I ever recorded as a member of the Hebdomadal Board. But if I had thought that the act in question was to be lasting and irrevocable, no power on earth should have induced me to be a party to it. I here indeed solemnly assert that this Bill of pains and penalties was intended only to be a temporary measure. This was distinctly stated by the principal advocates and framers of the measure, and it was well understood by the whole board, that if the apprehensions and suspicions entertained respecting your theological views should be allayed by your conduct in the discharge of your professorial duties, it should be proposed to Convocation to rescind the statute. It was with a clear recollection of this feeling, and a full reliance on the justice of the board, that in 1840, I myself proposed to the Heads of Houses and Proctors to revoke the measure of 1836. I had only to appeal to their equitable feeling and to the testimony which all the University seemed to bear to the soundness of your teaching and preaching, and the satisfactory manner in which you had filled the Divinity chair for upwards of four years to induce them to accede to my proposition. And had the same fair and just considerations presented themselves to members of Convocation generally, it would have been carried even there without opposition. But the same party which had so vehemently pressed the board to institute proceedings against you, again renewed their hostile agitation and as they canvassed voters far and near, whilst the board did not, I believe, solicit a single individual, they, as might have been expected, successfully

resisted the repeal of the statute. Every candid mind must, however, on considering the whole course of these proceedings, now look upon you as completely exonerated from all academical censure; and this conviction must be greatly confirmed by the praiseworthy manner in which you have performed the duties of your office for so many years. For my part I shall always be ready unhesitatingly to declare my belief that you are a sound and orthodox Church of England divine; and should it have so happened that Her Majesty's gracious commands in your favour had been addressed to me and not to the Dean of Hereford, I should certainly have complied with them not merely with submission, but with cheerful and ready obedience.

I beg you will make any use you may think proper of this communication, and believe me always, yours very faithfully,

J. A. CRAMER.

One of the most conspicuous documents which appeared at this time was a remonstrance addressed by thirteen of the Bishops to Lord John Russell, in which they expressed no opinion of their own upon the subject, excepting only such as might be implied by the act itself. The Prime Minister's reply puts the questions at issue in so clear a light, in a few pointed sentences, that its republication in this place is especially appropriate.

Protest of the Bishops.

My Lord,—We, the undersigned Bishops of the Church of England, feel it our duty to represent to your lordship, as head of her Majesty's Government, the apprehension and alarm which have been excited in the minds of the clergy by the rumoured nomination to the see of Hereford of Dr. Hampden, in the soundness of whose doctrine the University of Oxford has affirmed, by a solemn decree, its want of confidence.

We are persuaded that your lordship does not know how deep and general a feeling prevails on this subject; and we consider ourselves to be acting only in the discharge of our bounden duty both to the Crown and to the Church, when we respectfully but earnestly express to your lordship our

conviction that if this appointment be completed, there is the greatest danger both of the interruption of the peace of the Church, and of the disturbance of the confidence which it is most desirable that the clergy and laity of the Church should feel in every exercise of the royal supremacy, especially as regards that very delicate and important particular, the nomination to vacant sees.

We have the honour to be, my lord, your lordship's obedient faithful servants,

C. J. LONDON.
C. WINTON.
J. LINCOLN.
CHR. BANGOR.
HUGH CARLISLE.
G. ROCHESTER.
RICH. BATH and WELLS.
J. H. GLOUCESTER and BRISTOL.
H. EXETER.
E. SARUM.
A. T. CHICHESTER.
J. ELY.
SAML. OXON.

To the Right Hon. the Lord John Russell, &c. &c.

Reply of Lord John Russell.

Chesham-place, December 8, 1847.

My Lords,—I have have had the honour to receive a representation signed by your lordships on the subject of the nomination of Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford.

I observe that your lordships do not state any want of confidence on your part in the soundness of Dr. Hampden's doctrine. Your lordships refer me to a decree of the University of Oxford passed eleven years ago, and founded upon lectures delivered fifteen years ago.

Since the date of that decree Dr. Hampden has acted as Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford; and many Bishops, as I am told, have required certificates of attendance on his lectures before they proceeded to ordain candidates who had received their education at Oxford. He has likewise preached sermons for which he has been honoured with the approbation of several prelates of our Church.

Several months before I named Dr. Hampden to the Queen for the see of Hereford, I signified my intention to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and did not receive from him any discouragement.

In these circumstances, it appears to me that should I withdraw my recommendation of Dr. Hampden, which has been sanctioned by the Queen, I should virtually assent to the doctrine that a decree of the University of Oxford is a perpetual ban of exclusion against a clergyman of eminent learning and irreproachable life; and that, in fact, the supremacy which is now by law vested in the Crown is to be transferred to a majority of the members of one of our Universities.

Nor should it be forgotten, that many of the most prominent among that majority have since joined the communion of the Church of Rome.

I deeply regret the feeling that is said to be common among the clergy on this subject. But I cannot sacrifice the reputation of Dr. Hampden, the rights of the Crown, and what I believe to be the true interests of the Church, to a feeling which I believe to be founded on misapprehension and fomented by prejudice.

At the same time I thank your lordships for an interposition which I believe to be intended for the public benefit.

I have, &c.

J. RUSSELL.

To the Right Rev. the Bishops of London, Winchester, Lincoln, &c.

The circumstances attending the opposition to Dr. Hampden's appointment were so extraordinary that they cannot be estimated—nor can his part in them, as the person attacked, be rightly understood—without entering into details which it would be more congenial to personal feelings to omit. This applies particularly to the correspondence relating to an intimation from the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Wilberforce (the Bishop of the diocese) that it was proposed to institute a suit against him in the Court of Arches.* This suit was afterwards withdrawn by the promoters, on account of a legal difficulty.

* Even quite recently the Bishop's part on this occasion seems to have been entirely misunderstood. See the Bishop of Lincoln's letter to Dr. Temple,

The following letters explain the part Dr. Hampden took in this transaction. His reply to a letter giving him the first intimation of the suit, and to another letter from the Bishop of Oxford on the same subject, was as follows:—

Dr. Hampden to the Bishop of Oxford.

Christ Church: December 18, 1847.

My Lord,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your lordship's letters of the 16th and 17th instant, both of which reached me yesterday. Neither of them admitted of the instant reply which your lordship requested might be sent by the messenger who brought the second letter. But as it is obviously important that as little time should be lost as possible, consistent with due reflection on the subject, I hasten to give my answer to both. As regards the first letter I need say but little. I take it as an official intimation of some process being instituted against me through the medium of your lordship; and whether the process be put in action by yourself as its primary and ostensible promoter, or in a secondary but not less effectual sense by your transmitting it officially to the court instead of withholding your assent or putting your veto upon it, is perhaps immaterial. For I take your lordship's second letter to be virtually a supersession of the first. It is to this letter that I therefore now address myself.

As to both, however, I feel myself entitled to make one preliminary remark. Your lordship has omitted to name my accusers. Your reluctance to move without the previous interposition referred to in your second letter, and the pain with which you state you wrote the first, make me unwilling to lay much stress on the fact that the two letters combined only show me an avowed opponent in your lordship.

As an incumbent in your diocese—though, perhaps, from the peculiar tenure of my preferment there is not so full a canonical relation between us as is the case with other incumbents—I might have hoped for your aid and protection against

in the *Times* of December 11, 1869. Dr. Hampden's letter to Lord John Russell, referred to at the same time, is given in Appendix B., *post.*

process from unknown accusers, rather than the contrary. I take your lordship's second letter as a recognition of this view. I therefore dismiss the first with a protest against any informer, that I am bound to notice any act or attack without a name.

In regard to the second letter, your lordship's interposition is stated to be in your office of diocesan. I might ask under what branch of your lordship's jurisdiction the interposition takes place. If the queries which this letter contains had come from any other source, or been addressed to me under any other circumstances, I think I should have been justified in considering that an insult was not only conveyed, but intended to be conveyed to me, by having such elementary tests applied to one who holds the position I do. But, my lord, I am sure your intention is to be a messenger and instrument of peace; and I know too well what even Christian warfare is, not to meet such a proceeding on your part in the like kindly spirit. On this ground, therefore, and in perfect respect to your lordship as Bishop of the diocese, and for your personal satisfaction, I unhesitatingly reply in the affirmative. I say 'Yes' to all your queries on my belief, in that sense in which they are the plain, natural sense of our Articles and formularies. I need not discuss them; for I have repeatedly affirmed every position in them, drawn from those authoritative sources, commencing with my Catechism as a child, in the daily use of the liturgy, in my subscription and adherence to the Articles, and in the constant use of my ministerial offices. I have affirmed them in public and in private: in the pulpit, in my work, from the chair of Divinity, and the other offices I have held in the University; and in the very works which have attracted so much notice, and been subject to so much misrepresentation. Nay, I may quote yourself as the latest authority in support of this statement, for I am glad to read that you believe me to hold the true faith; that the cavils launched against what I have written are grounded on what merely *appears* to be unsound in language; that, even if it were really so, your Lordship does me the justice to say that you are sure I am unconscious of that unsoundness.

Your lordship speaks of the Church at large ratifying this withdrawal of all charges. Pardon me if I say that I have yet to learn that the Church at large has recognised any charges

whatever. And again, you speak of me forcing my way through all the obstacles before me to a disputed seat. My lord, I force my way nowhere. I know of no obstacle—legitimate, at least—to my taking upon myself the office for which I am designated, which will not have their due weight and effect; and I do not admit that my seat is disputed by any who have a right to call it in question, and other disputants will doubtless be duly met and disposed of.

I have therefore no fear that such influence as, under God's blessing, through the influence of his Holy Spirit, I shall be made an instrument of diffusing, in the service of the Divine Head of our Church, will be marred in the diocese to which I have been selected by the head of that Church on earth to which we both belong.

In conclusion, my lord, I must, in justice to other incumbents and members of the Church within your diocese, formally protest against being under any obligations to reply to the extra-judicial questions which you have put to me. I have already said that I answer them in deference to the motives which I attribute to your lordship in addressing me as you have. I forbear for the like reason to avail myself of the opportunity I might have taken of adverting to other acts of your lordship adverse to me * and my appointment, which are difficult to reconcile with your lordship's conviction of the soundness of my faith. I hail your lordship's avowal of this conviction as a putting on one side of what has gone before; and whilst I express my readiness to meet any opponent who shall implead in any court of legitimate jurisdiction, it will afford no little satisfaction to find that any such proceedings, injurious as they must be to the Church at all events, are prevented by your interposition as diocesan, or rather on the far wider ground of Christian brotherhood and charity.

It is needful, to prevent a misunderstanding of Bishop Hampden's true position at this time, to state that the reply to this letter gave him most distinctly to understand that his answer did not satisfy the Bishop of Oxford, and

* The Bishop of Oxford signed the petition to Lord John Russell against his appointment.

therefore the natural conclusion was that the suit would proceed. Certainly this last-mentioned letter was withdrawn by the writer; but the note withdrawing it reached Dr. Hampden at the same time as the letter itself, in consequence of his absence from home. Still it remains as proof, if such were wanting, that it was no admission, direct or indirect, on the part of the Bishop of Hereford, that induced the withdrawal of the suit. Indeed, so far convinced was he of its going forward, that he put the matter into the hands of his legal advisers, who counselled him not to receive any further communication personally addressed to him on the subject. The Bishop of Oxford next addressed him with a lengthened letter through the 'Times.'

A reference to a 'common friend' in this letter (dated December 28, 1847), called forth a forcible and memorable letter from the Provost of Oriel, which explains very clearly this somewhat difficult position of affairs.

The Provost of Oriel to the Bishop of Oxford.

Oriel College: January 1, 1848.

My dear Lord,—Having just read your lordship's letter to Dr. Hampden of December 28, published in the 'Times' of yesterday, I will at once anticipate, as the 'common friend' to whom you allude, a possible misconstruction which may be put upon your words to the prejudice of Dr. Hampden, and the revival of a most unhappy dispute. Allow me, however, first to say, that I am much gratified by your lordship's frank avowal of your change of sentiment in favour of the substantial soundness of Dr. Hampden's 'Bampton Lectures.' The conclusion at which you have arrived will, I believe, be that of all competent and unprejudiced judges, when they shall have studied them with equal care.

The misconstruction of your letter against which I would guard is this. It may be that persons will construe together the passage in which you speak of the assurance you possess of his future revision of the 'Bampton Lectures,' and that

'unqualified declaration of his faith' which you gather from his answer to your lordship's second letter, 'on the very points selected by the promoters of the suit as those supposed to be unsoundly treated;' and they may thus be led to expect from Dr. Hampden such a revision of his Lectures as will satisfy even those who sympathize with the promoters.

This, as your lordship is aware, was not his meaning; and from the very nature of the case no attempt could possibly succeed. For if, as I endeavoured to explain in my letter to your lordship of December 25, the objections of his leading adversaries rest upon unsound theories which they have adopted, and which his Lectures are calculated to explode, no revision which he can make without a sacrifice of truth can meet the views of such objectors. Even the 'Yes' which he returns, in his letter of December 18, to all your lordship's queries on his belief—since those queries appear to have been founded upon the 'points of doctrine' which it was alleged, in the 'articles' laid before you, 'his writings had impugned'—could not, I conceive, have been altogether unqualified. The words which follow, 'in the sense in which they are the plain, natural sense of our articles and formularies,' I understand to contain a qualification, and one which excludes his assent to such queries wherever they implied the promoters' unsound theories, and in that sense in which they implied them. All that Dr. Hampden could really intend to express, either in his letter to Lord J. Russell, or in the conversation which I had with him prior to any suit or any question from adverse parties, was simply what you have stated in another part of your letter: 'A readiness to remove in any reprint of his Bampton Lectures any incautious or obscure language which might have given rise to the impression that they contained unsound doctrines which he had not intended to put forth.' Believing that his Lectures contain important truth, which most of us require to know, and that their real value has often not been perceived in consequence of some obscure or incautious language, I shall rejoice if he finds leisure and opportunity to improve them.

But once more let me congratulate your lordship upon the withdrawal of this painful suit. Religious controversies on high points of doctrine ought not to be carried on in newspapers, and cannot be settled by courts of law. And some of

the questions now at issue, if discussed at all, should only be discussed in the most reverent manner by divines, tolerant of each other's opinions, and not forgetting peace whilst they aim at truth.

I write these observations upon my first perusal of your lordship's letter, conceiving it not impossible that I may be obliged to make them public, if the misconstruction of which I am apprehensive should be made; and I should myself incur blame if I had incautiously committed my friend to an engagement which he never made, and which, without the sacrifice of truth, he could not fulfil. But unless such a necessity should arise, I see no reason for pursuing the subject further, and I shall rejoice to find my apprehensions visionary.

I am, always, my dear lord, your lordship's faithful friend,

EDWARD HAWKINS.

Amidst trials and difficulties, harassing both to mind and body, there was great consolation and comfort in the many warm assurances which he received of trust and sympathy and attachment. No man ever sat on the bench of Bishops with more direct testimony in his favour. Tried to the utmost, he was not found wanting. Of the many addresses he received, not the least gratifying was one from the Board of Heads of Houses at Oxford; and its value was the greater from the fact that it was by the same Board which in 1836 submitted the vote of censure to the Oxford Convocation. This address was as follows:—

To the Rev. Dr. Hampden, Regius Professor of Divinity, &c. &c.

We, the undersigned Heads of Houses in the University of Oxford, have seen with great concern the reports of proceedings in various parts of the country, upon your proposed appointment to the see of Hereford, tending to injure your reputation, impede your future usefulness, and even create a general distrust of the soundness of your faith in our blessed Lord. Under such circumstances, although we only declare the sentiments which many of us have expressed before, and particularly upon

the enactment in 1842 of the new statute concerning theological instruction, we desire to assure you that having for several years enjoyed ample opportunities of learning the tenor of your public teaching, and hearing your discourses from the pulpit of the University, we are not only satisfied that your religious belief is sound, but we look forward with confidence in your endeavours to preach the Gospel of Christ in its integrity.

B. P. SYMONDS, Warden of Wadham, and Vice-Chancellor.
EDWARD HAWKINS, Provost of Oriel.
JAMES INGRAM, President of Trinity.
PHILIP WYNTER, President of St. John's.
JOHN RADFORD, Rector of Lincoln.
HENRY FOULKES, Principal of Jesus College.
THOMAS GAISFORD, Dean of Christ Church.
JOHN DAVID MACBRIDE, Principal of Magdalen Hall.
DAVID WILLIAMS, Warden of New College.
FREDERICK CHARLES PLUMPTRE, Master of Univ. Coll.
HENRY WELLESLEY, Principal of New Inn Hall.
R. BULLOCK MARSHAM, Warden of Merton.
WILLIAM THOMPSON, Principal of St. Edmund Hall.
JAMES NORRIS, President of C.C.C.
FRANCIS JEUNE, Master of Pembroke.

His fellow-citizens in Oxford, in a public address, assured him that for twelve years they had known his struggles and his trials, and had been taught by his example the efficiency of a genuine Christian faith. 'We,' this address says, 'cannot withhold from you, at this juncture, our testimony to the fulness of teaching with which, in the pulpits of our city, you have set forth, and enforced from time to time, the great cardinal doctrines of a religion based on the word of God.'

It would be endless to enumerate similar expressions of confidence and kindness which poured in from all parts of the country, from Ireland, and even from America. There was a general address, to which more than 2,000 signatures were appended, chiefly of the

clergy, but including the names of men of high standing in other professions, and members of both Houses of Parliament. A separate address was received from members of Convocation (Oxford), and others from many Chapters, including York and Gloucester. The private letters he received from many who were entire strangers to him told him of their prayers on his behalf, for his support and comfort in the struggle. And the point to which he attached the greatest importance was, that this support was offered to him on account of his teaching and defence of the principles of the Church of England as established by the Reformation.

CHAPTER XIII.

1847–1848.

ELECTION TO THE BISHOPRIC BY THE CHAPTER OF HEREFORD—'CONFIRMATION' OF THE ELECTION—OPPOSITION BY THREE CLERGYMEN—APPLICATION TO THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH—APPLICATION REFUSED—JUDGMENTS OF MR. JUSTICE ERLE AND THE CHIEF JUSTICE.

DECEMBER 28, 1847, was appointed by the Dean of Hereford for the election of a Bishop. The Dean,* the four Canons Residentiary—Mr. Morgan, Mr. Huntingford, Lord Saye and Sele, and Mr. Musgrave—and many of the Prebendaries, assembled in the Lady Chapel of Hereford Cathedral, which is used as a Chapter-House. The congé d'élire, and the 'letter missive' from the Queen, were read. The votes of the Chapter were then taken, all voting for Dr. Hampden until the name of Canon Huntingford was called on. After a long preamble he stated his desire to defer the election. In theory, he held it to be for the peace and safety of the Church that the Crown alone should nominate to vacant sees; in fact, he wished 'to wait for an impartial and solemn decision on this subject from a tribunal competent to pronounce it.' The Dean followed to the same effect.

When the votes were all taken, the election by the majority of the Cathedral Chapter was thus announced: 'Be it known unto all men, that a majority of the Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Hereford, in full Chapter this day assembled, have, in obedience to Her Majesty's licence, chosen the Reverend Renn Dickson Hampden, Doctor in Divinity, to be the future Bishop of this Cathedral Church

* The Dean wrote to inform Lord John Russell of his intention to oppose the election. For Lord John Russell's reply, see Appendix B., *post.*

and See, in the room of the Right Reverend Father in God, Thomas Musgrave, late Lord Bishop thereof, now translated to the Archbishopric of York.'

The next ceremony was the 'Confirmation of the Election' at Bow Church on January 11. The preliminary proceedings were in Doctors' Commons, where the Bishop elect was introduced to the Court, and their Lordships were requested to give their consent to the election. Dr. Hampden signed his assent to the same. All parties then proceeded to Bow Church, Cheapside, in which an immense crowd had assembled long before the time appointed for the service; the Vicar-General (Dr. Burnaby), with his Assessors—Dr. Lushington and Sir John Dodson—being the Commissioners appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The ceremony began with the Litany, after which the letters patent, signed by writ of Privy-Seal 'Langdale,' 'Benthall,' were read. The old custom of citing opposers followed, upon which citation three persons 'appeared,' by their proctor, as opposers—the Rev. R. W. Huntley, Vicar of Alberbury, Salop; the Rev. John Jebb, Rector of Peterstow, Herefordshire; the Rev. W. F. Powell, a perpetual Curate in the Diocese of Gloucester. The Court decided that the only point that could be argued was, whether they had a right to appear. It was argued at great length. The Court ruled that the right contended for was not proved. The Vicar-General 'was clearly of opinion that they were bound under the statute of Henry VIII. to proceed to the confirmation of the Bishop,' and he considered they would incur 'the penalties of *præmunire*' if they did not proceed to confirm the election. Dr. Lushington, in the course of his judgment, said: 'The statute referred to had been truly described to have been passed at the commencement of the Reformation: a statute memorable, no doubt, for all its provisions, and not the less so because it restored to the Crown of Great Britain its undoubted right, and put to sleep for ever the

pretensions of the Bishop of Rome: a statute to be held, therefore, in reverence, and to be carried into execution to the full extent of its spirit and its letter.' He concluded thus: 'I conceive it my duty to refuse to allow the appearance which is now offered, and to proceed to the confirmation of Dr. Hampden.' And so, with the usual formalities, the business of the confirmation of the election was brought to a close.*

Not so the attempts of the 'opposers.' This general name, which the law assigned to them, seems to be the one which best expresses their public appearance on this occasion. They held no pre-eminent or distinguished position in the Church or in the University; yet they put themselves forward when others of 'the party,' whose position would have given at least a colour to their appearance under such circumstances, held back. Their next move was an application to the Court of Queen's Bench for a mandamus to force the Archbishop of Canterbury to listen to them. The case—the Queen *v.* the Archbishop of Canterbury—lasted six days. The judges were Lord Denman (Chief Justice), Mr. Justice Patteson, Mr. Justice Coleridge, and Mr. Justice Erle. On January 14 Sir Fitzroy Kelly moved for 'a rule' to show cause why a mandamus should not issue, &c. The rule was granted. On the 24th the Attorney-General (Sir J. Jervis) began the argument against it. He was followed, on the same side, by the Solicitor-General (Sir David Dundas), Mr. M. D. Hill, Drs. Bayford and Twiss, and Mr. Waddington. The counsel for the 'opposers' were Sir Fitzroy Kelly, Mr. Badeley, and others.

Through the many long days the case lasted, the interest increased rather than lessened; and on February 1, when it was known that judgment would be given, the

* An eye-witness on this occasion says, 'When the bishop came out of the church, the immense crowd assembled outside cheered him most lustily, so that his cause was at any rate the popular one.'

greatest anxiety was excited to hear the decision. The Court was crowded with eager faces, some of which, it is said, looked blank and disappointed enough when the result of the trial was made known. Bishop Copleston (of Llandaff) was present, and in his kindly interest in his former college pupil (Bishop Hampden) was the first to tell him of the decision of the Court.

The first judgment was that of Mr. Justice Erle. The statute of Henry VIII.,* on the interpretation of which the case depended, is reviewed and illustrated by its history and by custom. The judge gives a clear and positive opinion that, by the statute, the appointment of Bishops is really and solely the prerogative of the Crown. Referring to the claims of the 'opposers,' he says: 'If the other parts of the statute are regarded, it is provided that the election by the Dean and Chapter of the King's nominee shall be good and effectual to all intents, and the clause relating to the command to confirm immediately follows. Confirming, in its ordinary sense, is consistent with this provision; but it is a contradiction in terms to say that an election may be good and effectual, to all intents—that is, absolute and conclusive—and at the same time voidable and inconclusive.'

With regard to the seeming inconsistency of the form, the judge said: 'It was obvious to anyone of legal experience that numerous forms of words still prevail in our law which are at variance with the fact they purport to state, some being vestiges of rights that have ceased, some being fictions to cover changes introduced into the law, and some from other sources. No reason is suggested why the form used by the apparitor at the confirmation may not belong to this class.' And referring to the non-exercise of opposition, he continues: 'If it had been more than a form, the right of opposing would probably have been exercised; yet no one recorded instance has been

* 25 Henry VIII. c. 20.

produced of an opposer having exercised the right now claimed by the applicants, in any country or at any time. The industry and research have been extreme; no restriction has been placed on reference to any kind of work, English or foreign, legal or historical; and all that has been shown in the way of acting on the right, before the present year, has been the attempt against Bishop Mountague, in the reign of Charles I., and the reported intention of making the attempt in two other cases, which never reached to action. If the evidence of the practical exercise of the right wholly fails, so does the evidence of opinion among the writers of recognised authority on English law. From Lord Coke to Mr. Justice Blackstone, no expression of any author has been adduced to show that the right in question was considered by him to exist, or had been brought to his notice. The absence of usage, and the absence of recognition by text-writers, is not merely a failure of support for the case of the applicants, but of positive force against them.' Further on, the concluding sentence is to this effect: 'After giving my best attention to the argument, my mind is brought to the clear conclusion that the supposed right does not exist, and that the rule for a mandamus ought to be discharged.'

The judgments of Mr. Justice Coleridge and of Mr. Justice Patteson were both in favour of granting the mandamus.

The fourth and last judgment was that of Lord Denman. There is an account, in this judgment, of what the Metropolitan's office was in times when the election was real. He was to ascertain that the election was duly made, and the identity of the person who brought the certificate: 'Those who maintain this rule say he had much more to do, to hold a court for summoning accusers from every quarter, and for hearing every kind of objection to the eligibility of the Lord Bishop elect; and the question is not whether he had authority to confirm or not, and to ex-

ercise some discretion, but whether he was bound to open a court of this description for the purpose first described. Such is the duty now sought to be imposed on the Archbishop of Canterbury.'

Lord Denman also dwelt on the position in which the nominee of the Crown would be placed by such a proceeding: 'The favour of his sovereign is supposed to place the Lord Bishop elect in no position analogous to anything I am aware of but that of a felon, upon whose trial a jury is charged; he has pleaded "not guilty," and forthwith all persons are invited by public proclamation, if they know of any treasons, murders, felonies, or other misdemeanors done or committed by the prisoner, to come forward and give their evidence.' He further says: 'I am fully convinced that the practice has never existed at all authoritatively in this country, and for this I mainly rely on the arguments of those learned gentlemen who have supported the present motion. They have satisfied me that no such opposer ever has been heard on any such occasion. . . . That the appointment of Bishops is vested exclusively in the Crown, since the time of Henry VIII., has been an universal opinion: that any opposer ever appeared, there is not even the shadow of a surmise.'

It had been argued that the Archbishop was placed in an anomalous position, if he was forced by law to confirm the election of a person he judged unfit. To this an answer is given as follows: 'Extreme cases are ingeniously devised, but are not, and cannot with decency be thought, possible; but even if the worst be supposed, if the Crown will persist against warning and remonstrance in nominating a Bishop whom the Metropolitan cannot consent to confirm without violating his conscience, his duty is clear. He must act as some of our predecessors in old times have done, when required to submit to dictation from the Crown. They forfeited their offices by not obeying. He must resign. From the course taken by

the present Archbishop, I have no doubt that after hearing the objections notoriously made to the doctrine of Bishop Hampden, his Grace has formed the deliberate opinion that those objections have no solid foundations.' In announcing his decision, the Chief Justice says: 'I own that my opinion is so entirely settled, and I must say so entirely unchanged by what I have heard of the argument to-day, that feeling the utmost disposition to do all that can be done to show my respect for my learned brothers, I do not think that I can consent to say, for my part, that this writ ought to go. I think it ought not—I feel confident that if it went it would be good for nothing—if held valid, *primâ facie*, I have no doubt that the return which would be made to it would give it a complete answer. I am satisfied that the only effect of all this would be to keep alive the dreadful agitation and frightful state of religious, or rather let me say, theological animosity which it is impossible not to observe in this country.'

CHAPTER XIV.

LETTERS TO MR. W. W. HULL AND BISHOP COPLESTON—CONSECRATION AS BISHOP OF HEREFORD—SERMON BY DR. HINDS—ENTRY ON EPISCOPAL WORK—VOTES FOR THE JEWISH DISABILITIES BILL—THIRD EDITION OF 'BAMPTON LECTURES.'

THE letters written by Dr. Hampden at this period naturally refer to the one subject which was pressed hourly on his attention. They were written in snatches of time, and in answer to anxious questions from friends who were more disturbed in mind on his account than he was for himself; for though he was not indifferent, yet amidst troubles and difficulties that would have unnerved an ordinary mind he never lost the calm temper with which he was pre-eminently endowed. In a letter to Mr. Hull, in which he refers to the 'confirmation,' he says:—

Dr. Hampden to Mr. W. W. Hull.

I am always glad to hear from you; and I was wishing to know what you thought of the present state of the case.

Surely these men have utterly perverted, or rather attempted to pervert, the object of a 'confirmation.' It was never contemplated in the citation of opposers that parties should combine, and get up a case, and bring forward articles, &c. That sort of concert could never have been thought of when travelling, and all sorts of communication throughout the country, were so difficult as they were two or three hundred years ago. Then the Archbishop, when he sends his Vicar-General to confirm an election, is supposed to have already judged of the fitness of the elected and regularity of the election. That 'substance' which these men wanted to raise up within the shadow of the 'form' never existed. The 'form' was never

used for the purpose of raising objections (except in Montague's case) on moral grounds, and never certainly of *doctrinal*. In Popish times, to which these men appeal, *doctrinal* questions would never have been submitted to such a tribunal. In their rage, however, they care not what they attack, insomuch that these great upholders in word of Church authority have put themselves in collision with the Archbishop of Canterbury, and done their utmost to disquiet him in his last days. It has been most gratifying to me that the poor old Archbishop has shown so kindly a spirit towards me. In his letters to me, he expressed his wish to officiate in person at the consecration; and I replied that I should much wish it myself, and would rather wait therefore until he might be strong enough. This alone has occasioned delay. Now, of course, there must be a Royal Commission. Perhaps by this time he has been called hence. The last accounts spoke of him as sinking rapidly. I wish you were in London to be present at the consecration. I am sure I should have your hearty prayers. . . . I certainly will avail myself of your kind hospitality when I proceed to the duties of the diocese in your neighbourhood. Mrs. Hampden begs me expressly to state from her how much pleasure she too will have in paying you a visit. She does not forget the long friendly proses that you have had together, and she longs to have another talk-out with you; you know she does not enter into these matters as a mere looker-on.

Again, he writes to the same friend—

The mass of ignorance and passion which the proceedings now going on disclose would be incredible in an age boasting its religious enlightenment, did we not actually witness it. The attacks on me on this occasion have been all anonymous —those, at least, I have seen or heard of. They are ashamed, as they well may be, to show their faces.

Remarking on the often repeated assertion that the 'peace of the Church' had been broken by his appointment, he says:—

The peace of the Church in name—in truth, the unmolested action of a turbulent faction, already with arms in their hands, and harassing everyone who does not sympathise with them,

professedly dissatisfied with the present state of things in the Church, attracting to their interests the great and the wealthy, carrying on, in short, all the acts of a conspiracy, engaged in a project of revolution, demagogues in their way just as much as —— and his brother ecclesiastics in Ireland are in theirs. Is —— prepared to sacrifice the cause of truth and justice to such a 'peace' as has been of late subsisting in the Church? What would have become of the Reformation—what indeed of the first preaching of the Gospel, had such a peace as —— so fondly cherishes been regarded as the one paramount object of Christian men? Nor is the case to which he appeals—of war with a foreign country—at all analogous. A false peace at home—at home—in our own house—is a very different thing from jealousies and rumours of war from without, as is quite obvious.*

To the Bishop of Llandaff (Copleston) he wrote at this time:—

Dr. Hampden to Bishop Copleston.

I sincerely thank you for your very kind letter of congratulation on my appointment to the See of Hereford. It is indeed a most happy termination of my Oxford labours and anxieties, and it adds much to the pleasure of the occasion that the appointment should meet with your approval. For I trust that you will allow me still to look up to you with the same feelings with which I used to do so formerly at Oriel, and be animated by your approving voice. You will be happy to learn that I have received much kindness from the authorities here, especially on this occasion, so that I shall leave even Oxford not without regret, though there may be some still whom unhappily nothing can soften.

Another letter to Bishop Copleston is dated January 14, 1848:—

I hope Mr. Burder has already anticipated me in a request which I wish to make, that your Lordship will kindly allow me to mention your name to the Archbishop of Canterbury as one of the bishops who will officiate at my consecration. It will be

* Letter to W. W. Hull, Esq., February 18, 1848.

a great gratification to me that one under whom Providence placed me in early life, and who has always been so kind a friend to me, should assist in the solemn ceremony. The day has not yet been fixed, and probably will not be until three or four weeks hence, as the Archbishop has lately been much indisposed, and I should wish to wait till he is able to officiate in person, which he has very kindly expressed a desire to do.

In the 'Memoir of Bishop Copleston' (p. 207) there is an extract from his diary:—'February 24 (1848), St. Matthias's day.—Being uncertain when I might be called upon to assist at Dr. Hampden's consecration, and having eight candidates whose services were much wanted, I fixed on this Saint's-day, rather than a Sunday, for the ordination at St. Gregory's Church.'

In consequence of the death of Archbishop Howley, and the length of time required for the election and confirmation of the Bishop of Chester (Dr. Sumner), who was to be his successor, the consecration of Dr. Hampden did not take place until March 26. It was at Lambeth, the assistant prelates being the Bishops of Llandaff (Dr. Copleston), Worcester (Dr. Pepys), and Norwich (Dr. Stanley). The sermon was preached by Dr. Hinds, then Prebendary of Castlenock and Chaplain to Archbishop Whately and the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and afterwards Bishop of Norwich. The only allusion made by the preacher to the struggle which had preceded the consecration was in these striking words:—

'We may all deplore our divisions. We may presume, too, that all who have taken any part in reference to them have done so on grounds which appear to them to justify the part they have taken. It is no wish of mine to revive, here or elsewhere, the discussion of a subject so painful and humiliating. Would that our divisions, and all that has given rise to them, could be, at once and for ever, buried in oblivion! One remark only I would venture to make. The occasion of strife is not necessarily the cause

of it. Our Saviour said of Himself, "I am not come to send peace on the earth, but a sword"—to be the occasion of strife of which others would be the guilty cause.'

Something of 'the peace' so eloquently described in this sermon was certainly experienced by the newly-consecrated Bishop of Hereford. There were no harsh acts—no rough words—of his that could rise up to mar the hopeful and eager spirit in which he looked forward to entering upon the duties of his office. 'I know nothing of Herefordshire,' he says, 'but I hear everything favourable of it: indeed Ormerod * says it is the most delightful diocese in England. It is just what I should have chosen had I had all fair England before me.' This feeling remained with him all through his life, increasing, rather than diminishing, with a nearer acquaintance.

The intense excitement of this time must of necessity make any relation of succeeding, and happily more tranquil, years appear to be wanting in the stirring though painful interest of this juncture.

Some idea of the fever of the opposition may be gathered from the fact that even the magnitude of the events passing on the Continent at this time (the early part of 1848) and the landing of the King Louis Philippe as an exile in England, in no way diverted the public attention from the Bishop elect; nor was there any cessation of the vehement and personal attacks on him by the journals and periodicals in the interest of the party who assailed him. But when all these efforts had been made—and, moreover, completely failed—when he entered fully on the duties of his office, his calm temper, finely-balanced intelligence, and quick sympathy would naturally, in the most zealous discharge of duty, avoid, rather than solicit, the observation that is courted by fussiness and self-assertion.

* The Venerable Archdeacon Ormerod.

His first visit to Hereford was in the spring-time, when the country is in more than ordinary beauty. There was then, in 1848, no railroad nearer to Hereford than Gloucester, from whence to Hereford (some thirty miles) the landscape becomes more and more interesting, until the traveller comes in sight of the cathedral tower, which, though of no great height, stands out grandly in the view, from the solidity of its proportions and its position, with the lovely river Wye taking its course so near its grey walls. Crowds lined the way as he approached the city, and he was met with every demonstration of respect and welcome. The cathedral was under restoration, and was with some difficulty put in sufficient order for the ceremony of enthroning the Bishop.

This first visit was necessarily a very short one, as the duty which devolved upon him, as junior Bishop, of reading prayers in the House of Lords, necessitated his immediate return to London. He preached one sermon there at this time, in the parish church of All Saints, in aid of the schools, and even his first inquiries, relating to the means of education in Hereford, impressed him with the conviction that this subject must receive his earliest attention. In an account of this visit, he says:—'All went off very favourably at Hereford to the last. We had an immense congregation at All Saints' church on the Sunday. But the zeal for schools seems to be at zero in the town, if not in the diocese at large. We shall have a deal to do in that way; for, without effective schools, what will become of the Church twenty years hence, or less?'

Those who saw him quietly going through any one of the various duties of his position would scarcely credit the amount of work he got through at this time. He received numerous requests to preach in and around London—many more than he found it possible to comply with. Not only were the Sundays, while he was in London,

constantly so employed, but often on week-days he was similarly engaged, as well as in delivering addresses on various occasions, such as the distribution of prizes at school gatherings, and in taking part in meetings of various charitable institutions.

In this year (1848) he was requested by the Vice-Chancellor to preach the sermon for the Infirmary at Oxford, which always takes place in the Commemoration week. On this occasion the amount collected was one of the largest ever known, and very far above the average.

Although at this time, on account of his duty in the House of Lords, he was at a distance from his diocese, he was careful to obtain, by inquiries, a general knowledge of its wants and difficulties, especially with the view of regulating the examination and preparing questions for his approaching first ordination on Trinity Sunday.

On the occasion of the ordinations he was anxious and watchful, and desirous of obtaining a knowledge of each individual candidate, and ascertaining his fitness, not only in respect of moral character and necessary acquirements, but with regard especially to the peculiarities of the parish in which it would be his duty to minister. Of the first ordination at Hereford, he says: 'I have had a most interesting visit to Hereford. The candidates were all respectable, and I hope will do good service in the Church. They called on me in the afternoon with a request to publish the sermon. I told them I would consider of it. But I left it at Hereford, and I shall not trouble with it further, I think. I trust it has answered its purpose.'

During the session of 1848 the second reading of the Jewish Disabilities Bill was thrown out of the House of Lords by 163 to 128. Bishop Hampden voted with the minority. It may here be remarked, by the way, though without any direct bearing on the question of the admission of the Jews to Parliament, that he never joined in

any society especially formed to single out the Jews for conversion. He considered this mode of distinguishing any race or nation objectionable and unnecessary, and that the Jews were fully included in all Christian efforts to bring men to name the name of Christ in sincerity.

There had been a call for another edition of his 'Bampton Lectures,' and so great had been the sale of the last that it was difficult to find a copy to put into the printer's hands. There is prefixed to this third edition a notice that 'it is an exact reprint from the two former editions, and page for page from the second edition, as the author had not leisure for any revision of the work, which has now been passed through the press under the superintendence of a friend.' In a letter on this subject he says: 'I write now merely about your references to certain passages. No doubt there are many places one would wish to correct or improve, if this were a *revised* edition. But there would be no knowing where to stop if once a correction were made. This is one reason why I would rather not even read over a *proof*, and am so much obliged to you for relieving me of this unpleasantness amidst the other kindness of your trouble in undertaking the reprint. I am sure if I were to go over the proofs myself I should find much to be dissatisfied with, much that I would wish to express differently, without thinking at all of what the enemy might have objected to, simply to meet my own taste. I have corrected my University sermons, before printed, after this fashion, in reprinting them in a new volume. Besides, I think it very important that the "Bampton Lectures" should reappear in this edition—at any rate, exactly in the form in which they have been carped at.' Again, he writes:—'I think it would be better not to contemplate any translation of passages, or any appendix, or supplemental volume at present. We have enough in hand, in all conscience, at present. At this time last year I had

made arrangements for reprinting, with considerable enlargement, my article on Aristotle. A great deal of it would be useful in order to the "Bampton Lectures." I wish I could find time, and some of poor Arnold's indomitable energy, to go on with it.' Some of his friends wished to have a portrait added to the volume, to which he replied: 'As to your proposal of the frontispiece, I think I could hardly be still *in vivis* and thus appear. It was very well for poor Arnold, when his friends had lost the reality, to have the shadow of his intelligent and truth-speaking countenance put where it is.'

CHAPTER XV.

CONFIRMATIONS IN 1848 — A CONFIRMATION SERMON — LETTER TO MISS BIDDULPH ON A CASE OF LATE BAPTISM—ORDINATIONS—CASE OF LITERATES—LETTERS DIMISSORY—SUNDRY LETTERS—THE 'NEMESIS OF FAITH.'

In the autumn of 1848 Bishop Hampden made an extensive tour of confirmations, taking care to divide parishes in such a manner that the candidates should not have any great distance to go, and, consequently, holding confirmations in many an out-of-the-way village where a bishop had never been seen before, so at least it was said. The conveyance of the children to be confirmed was always a point much considered by him—that they, especially the girls, should be taken back to their homes under some good care. It gratified him to learn in more than one instance that the railway officials had kindly taken the candidates to the confirmation and back free of all charge. Acts of considerate kindness were always remembered by him and often referred to on public occasions, and thereby a spirit of helpfulness was encouraged, and many, not immediately concerned in the confirmations, took an interest in forwarding any plan for the protection and convenience of the candidates. He was anxious to see the parents, brothers, and sisters come to the church with those to be confirmed, and in his address always reminded them of their part and duty on the occasion towards those of their own households. With this view, it occurred to him that it might be easier for them to attend on the Sunday, and in a letter on this subject he asks: 'Do you anticipate any objection to the confirmation in a large *town* parish (confined exclusively to town

people) being on a *Sunday*. It might be so managed as to call no clergyman from his Sunday duty; and it appears to me it would have a good effect in admitting of the presence of a larger body of the poor. It would also be a very natural sequel of the practice of administering baptism after the Second Lesson on Sunday. Will you ask one or two of your worthy clerical neighbours what they think of the plan?'

The following extract from a sermon (now in MS.) preached at a Sunday confirmation may be quoted here:—

'And what shall I say, more especially to those of the congregation who stand in the relation of parents, elder brothers, or sisters, or in any respect interested for those who have presented themselves this day to claim the promise of God, made over to them as infants through the faith of others bringing them to Christ, and seek the help and strength of His Holy Spirit, that they may continue in His love to their lives' end? How anxious should all such relatives and friends be at this moment for the well-being, both temporal and eternal, of these young persons! The good providence of God has joined us together—first in the great society of the Church; then in distinct portions of it, as in parishes and separate congregations; then by a still closer union in particular households and homes, that we might be in these circles, as it were, one with another, under stricter and stricter obligations, to be mutual helps, ever at hand in all things belonging to life and godliness, to one another. He, as the common Father of us all, from whom (as St. Paul speaks to the Ephesians) the whole family, every fatherhood (πᾶσα πατριὰ) in heaven and earth is named, looks down upon us all—now reconciled to Him, and adopted by him in the Beloved Son—as His children, with parental, tender love. How should all fathers and mothers on earth, then, feel the love of God towards those so dear to them

as their own children, acting as an all-powerful motive to them to fulfil in their conduct the love of the Heavenly Father towards their children, praying for them earnestly, and watching for them, to keep them, as far as possible, out of the way of temptation, and by their own Christian example, at once lead them and show them the way by which God may be served, and the salvation of their souls, through Christ, be worked out, amidst their daily work of providing for the life that now is, and the dangers to which their necessary intercourse with the world around them exposes them. Oh! if all elders in a parish, and in a family, would but thus feel it to be their duty and their delight to be the dispensers of the Heavenly Father's love towards those of His children in Christ whom He has placed under their wing and before their eyes as objects of their special care, what would be the peace, and the comfort, and the Christian joy in the Spirit, in parishes and in families! Then, indeed, would the great blessing of Holy Baptism into the Faith of Christ be fully developed among us; whereas, through our own forgetfulness of our high calling by that Sacrament to be children of God in Christ and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven, through the Death and Resurrection of Christ, its blessedness is obscured to the view, too often, unhappily, by the conduct of professing Christians giving no evidence of that grace which they have received of dying with Christ, as to this world, and of being raised up with Him from the grave of earth to the Life which is hidden with Christ in God!'

This, Bishop Hampden's first general view of the diocese, was in every way cheering and satisfactory to him. 'You will be happy to learn,' he writes to Mr. Hull (who was then living in the diocese, at Tickwood), 'that I go on with great satisfaction and even delight in my work. I have found great seriousness (at least, I fully believe so) in the candidates; and I earnestly hope a lasting im-

pression has been made on many. Everywhere, too, I experience the greatest kindness.' After his return home he wrote: 'I trust I have done some good; I have certainly tried to do so.'

A letter, in answer to a question relating to the baptism and confirmation of a child, asked by a lady especially interested in the parish school in which the girl was a scholar, though written at a much later date, may find a place here on account of the subject of which it treats:—

Bishop Hampden to Miss Biddulph.

The Palace, Hereford: April 26, 1865.

My dear Miss Biddulph,—I am sorry that I have not been able to answer your letter before, having only returned from Shropshire yesterday evening, and found your letter there awaiting my arrival. You have been anxious, no doubt, to hear about the little girl of your school for whom you are so much interested. From the account, then, which you give of her, I quite agree with you that her's cannot be regarded as a case for *infant* baptism. It is altogether an exceptional case, as she can, both with understanding and feeling, answer for herself. There must, of course, be godfathers and godmothers, as intimated in the Rubric and Service, to present her at the font, and as witnesses to the baptism; and the clergyman by whom the service is performed must approve her previously, as qualified for the reception of the Sacrament. After this, it will rest, of course, with the particular clergyman in whose parish she may be residing whether he will present her at once for confirmation, notwithstanding her early age. I can only say, if she continued in my diocese, I should certainly not object to receive, as a candidate for that rite, one whom I should have reason to think so well qualified as herself, though below the general standard in point of age.

I remain, yours faithfully,

R. D. HEREFORD.

The ordinations were occasions of much anxiety to him. Although the majority of the candidates usually

passed the examination in a satisfactory manner, instances occurred from time to time when, after the greatest consideration, and most indulgent efforts on his part and that of his chaplains to draw out the necessary knowledge, it was impossible for them to allow a candidate to present himself when the day of ordination arrived. Sometimes a case would occur of mingled forwardness and ignorance that gave little hope of future amendment. In one instance a candidate copied from his neighbour, and the fact was proved with the most distressing certainty. How deeply this hurt and disquieted him, it is impossible to say. At times he would sigh as he read over the answers to the day's paper of questions, and say, '*If* they would only learn a little.' He did not, as a rule, receive Literates as candidates for ordination, and in an answer to an application made to him through Mr. Hayward Cox (one of his Chaplains), he says: 'The case of Mr. —— is an interesting one. But it will not do to make a precedent of admitting Literates as candidates. My diocese is not like some others, where it is difficult to get a supply of University men. The fact is, that curacies are in great requisition, and there are now one or two Christ Church men that I know anxious to get curacies in the diocese. The limit I fix is—not that the candidates must be University men strictly, but—that they must have passed through a regular course at some collegiate institution in connexion with the Church—as St. Bees', or King's College, London—and have the testimonial of such institution. If, then, this gentleman persists in his wish, would it not be best to advise him to enter himself as a theological student at King's College, London, and attend the lectures there for two years, after which, on examination, they would give him their certificate?'

He strongly objected to giving what are called 'Letters Dimissory' (the form in which one bishop requests a brother bishop to ordain a candidate not

examined by him or belonging to his diocese). 'I cannot,' he writes on one occasion, 'accede to the request made by Mr. —— of giving him Letters Dimissory to the Bishop of Winchester, whose Ordination is so near at hand. It would be quite inconsistent, as he has not had sufficient interval to read and improve himself. The very earliest time when he could present himself would be at the ordination at the end of September. But the proper way will be for him to go up for the Theological Examination at Cambridge in October, and to present himself again at Hereford at Christmas.' He adds: 'Might it not be proper to give him a hint, through the tutor, of the manner in which he came before us—smelling of smoking? Really, the habit is no little offence in a clergyman. It gives a suspicion of a luxurious, self-indulgent person, though the individual may be quite free from such a charge.'*

How anxious he was as to the suitability of a curate for his position is shown in the following extract: 'I hope I have brought the —— matter to a termination—the best, at any rate, under the circumstances. But now my difficulty is about a curate for the next twelvemonth. Can you think of any one likely to do? It requires a man with a good deal of ballast—not too young or too old, who will do the duty, turning neither to the right hand, nor to the left, but as his zeal for the good of souls may carry him—a man, too, with sound lungs and a good manner. Can you find anyone willing to give himself up to this duty—not a pleasant one, so far as late circumstances are considered, but in which he may do great good? I am anxious to obtain the services of such a person as soon as possible. If, by inquiry at Oxford or elsewhere, you may be able to strike on the needful man, I shall be greatly obliged.'†

* Letter to the Rev. W. Hayward Cox.

† The incumbent had been forced to leave his parish under painful circumstances.

With regard to allowing strangers to officiate in the diocese, he wrote on one occasion: 'It is quite necessary to enforce the rule (which is acted on in several dioceses already) of not allowing strangers to officiate more than a week or two at most, in any parish, without sanction. A very gross instance has just occurred in Mr. ——'s own parish, which shows the necessity of a strict maintenance of this rule.'

Some short extracts from hastily-written letters are here added containing his remarks and opinion on more general subjects:

Bishop Hampden to the Rev. W. Hayward Cox.

I had heard of a proceeding to get up an *undergraduate* petition against the clause in Lord Brougham's Bill,* through an undergraduate who had refused his signature. It is a great shame that such a proceeding should be allowed in the University. The Vice-Chancellor's attention, and that of the Heads generally, ought to be called to it. The truth is only partially stated in this paper. The 'principle' objected to already exists in the law. The proposed new enactment only substitutes a more reasonable penalty instead of a præmunire. The pinch is, that the penalty is a more practicable one, and such as would be enforced if incurred. I hope it will pass.

. . . . . .

Is anything doing in Oxford about the Bill for the 'Protection of Women?' I think that a very good and necessary measure. It is virtually Mr. Spooner's Bill, which failed in the House of Commons, at least in design. This is to prevent the infamous *trading* in vice which is so successfully carried on from London throughout the country. The object seems a feasible one; and I should hope if this outwork were secured, it would help materially to check the vice itself, as well as save many from extreme misery. I presented a petition (in the House of Lords) on the subject, from Hereford, the other day, most respectably as well as numerously signed. I wish

* Proposing a change in the law of *Præmunire*.

other petitions could be poured in; then, perhaps, the law lords in the House would be stimulated to prepare an unexceptionable measure on the subject.

. . . . . .

When is the new Examination Statute to be proposed in Convocation? I think the Chief Professors ought always *ex officio* to be of the Board of Examiners in their own subjects; and I wish to see the Theology Professors constitute a board for examining all candidates for the degree of B.A. in Divinity, separating that examination *in time* from the other parts of the degree examination.

. . . . . .

I have run through the 'Nemesis of Faith.' It is valuable evidence of the working of Tractarianism. It advocates not only speculative infidelity, and, by consequence, atheism, but the worst of immorality (just, indeed, what might be augured from the spread of Tractarianism)—sensuality, under the mark of tender feeling and refinement of intellectual perception and sentiment. I have been much disgusted with it.

In another letter he alludes to the same work, and says it shows 'how infidelity is the natural result of that disparagement of Scripture, in order to raise the standard of tradition and Church authority, which —— and —— and the "Tracts" have been inculcating; and how, also, a corruption of moral feeling is the fruit of that morbid imaginative sentimentality and poetical religion which their teaching would propagate throughout the Church.'

CHAPTER XVI.

1849-50.

EARLY EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS IN THE DIOCESE OF HEREFORD—SPEECH ON EDUCATION IN COUNTRY DISTRICTS—CHARACTERISTICS AS A SPEAKER—REMARKS ON EDUCATION IN FIRST CHARGE.

THE Parliamentary Session of 1849 was unusually long; and as Bishop Hampden was still the junior bishop in the House of Lords, he was detained in London until the beginning of September, to his great regret. For, besides the general business of the diocese, he was anxious that something should be done without loss of time towards improving the means of education for the poor. The deficiency in this respect was especially forced on his attention in the city of Hereford, where, in one parish with (at that time) a population of 5,000 souls, there was no day-school; and in another parish, although there were good schools, they were more or less of the character of private schools: there was no National School. Moreover, this state of things had existed for ten years, with the means at hand for its remedy. A bequest of considerable amount had been made by Lord Scudamore in the reign of Charles II. for the benefit of the poor in the city of Hereford, but under conditions which it was found impossible to carry out. An Act of Parliament had consequently been passed, allowing the trustees of the charity to apply its funds to the purpose of the education of the poor of the city. Ten years had elapsed since the passing of the Act, and during that time the trustees (many of them differing in religion and opinion) had been unable to light upon any scheme for carrying it into effect.

At a meeting called under Bishop Hampden's presidency, as Bishop of the diocese, he brought all the circumstances of the case before the trustees. His conduct in the chair on this occasion represents very truly the part he took in matters that related to what may be distinguished as the 'business' part of his office. For while he used his best endeavours to draw men of different opinions and tempers together, by his courteous and ready recognition of the many causes that made it difficult for them to act in unison, he never withheld his own opinion; nor did he court popularity or personal influence by any concession of his opinions. He put the case, as it appeared to him, fairly before the trustees, strongly admonishing them as to their duty and responsibility. He told them, with reference to this fund, that he 'thought their suffering the money to remain so long in abeyance was not only a great loss to the poor children, but to the cause of education and to society at large; and it had now become a scandal to them, that for ten years the trustees had had the control of that money, and nothing had yet been done to appropriate it to beneficial uses. He believed they had almost subjected themselves to an information in the Court of Chancery, for not having applied the funds of the charity to the object named in the Act.'* The great difficulty in the establishment of the requisite schools was, the religious instruction; in this matter the trustees themselves held different opinions. The Bishop told them that 'the great secret was to have an efficient school; one, he would say, based upon Church principles, yet such, that none might be excluded on account of their religious opinions. There might be some difficulties in the carrying out of the project; but he hoped from the kind feeling that seemed to prevail, that no minor point would be pressed which would frustrate the great object

* Report of the meeting in the *Hereford Times*, November 17, 1849.

they all had in view—the education of the poor children of the city, thus giving them a knowledge of their duty towards God, and making them useful and valuable members of society at large.' He said, further, that he 'fully calculated on the same liberal feeling on the part of the trustees which he himself entertained. He repeated that he had no wish to promote any exclusive, sectarian system; but, at the same time, he felt bound to maintain the superiority of the communion to which he belonged,* and to which he felt attached, believing that it taught the truth. While he said this, he allowed every consideration for the honest scruples of others, assigning to them the same conscientious motives which actuated himself, following as they did the same Scriptures for their guide.'

In the course of his speech on this occasion, he said he was anxious to make the school as far as possible a self-supporting institution, and alluded, in support of his opinion, to the success of a school of this description which had been established by the Rev. Mr. Dawes in a parish in Hampshire. Afterwards, in 1850, Mr. Dawes became Dean of Hereford, and the Scudamore School was greatly indebted to his ability and experience in educational matters for its present flourishing condition.

An impulse having thus been given to the cause of education in the city of Hereford, the Bishop next turned his attention to planning an Educational Society that should embrace the whole diocese. For this purpose he called a public meeting at Hereford on December 15, 1849. The fact that the political disturbances of 1848 were

* The resolutions drawn up and read at this meeting, provided that the Church Catechism was to be taught in the school, but that where Dissenters had any conscientious objection to the doctrines it contained, their children might be absent from the school during the periods of catechetical instruction. Lord Scudamore was a Churchman, and the Act regulating the charity carried out his intention by ordering that the Bishop of the diocese, for the time being, should have the direction of the school which it established.

chiefly confined to London and the larger towns, had given a plausible pretext to those who were lukewarm in the cause of rural education; and on this occasion he pointed out to such persons, that if the rural districts had escaped that danger, there were others—less noisy, less palpable, but no less terrible in their consequences—to which they had shown themselves peculiarly liable. 'Theories of liberty, fraternity, and equality,' he said, 'are not so easily propagated amidst a scattered agricultural people as in the masses of towns; but there is a class of feelings existing in every human breast, however untutored, and however separate from communion (*i.e.* society with others), which are ready to be awakened by every touch. I mean the religious instincts of the human heart. The feelings to which the demagogue appeals are often merely artificial; they are taken up by sympathy; some bold fallacy is thrown out in specious language, and people are hurried away into some fancied conclusion, without further thought, by the mere sound of something great and striking, though unreal. But it is not so with the religious instincts. These are real and deep-seated, yet lively, and ever ready to be called into action. Any clergyman who has had the charge of a country parish, any one indeed who has resided in the country any time, will bear witness to this. How readily, for example, will not any fanatical preacher collect around him a village congregation. Look at the gross imposture of Mormonism, of those called the Latter-day Saints. Has not even this obtained its ready hearers, its devoted disciples, among our villagers; and not indeed among the worst class of these, but some of those who were once among the diligent attendants at their parish church? I have known such instances myself. And what are we to argue from such instances, but that the religious instincts, or feelings, or sentiments (or whatever else we may call them), require cultivation and training from youth; that they are plants,

the roots of which must not be suffered to lie in the ground neglected, until some hot sun may suddenly draw them forth into vegetation; but that we ought to cultivate them betimes, watch their growth with care, and provide that they may develop themselves into a wholesome life and vigour. Like our other feelings and capacities, they are not given us by our Almighty Creator in their full perfection at once, as the instincts of the brute animals. But they are given us by Him to be formed, directed, matured, guarded from perversion by the discipline of proper habits from childhood, by instruction, admonition, correction, good example. How forcibly then does the necessity of having good schools of moral and religious discipline for the young children of the poor result from such a consideration. I know it has been contended that all such training in religious truth and ways is but giving prejudices to the young, and that the proper education is to strengthen the faculties and leave every one to choose for himself afterwards of what religion he will be. Never was any fallacy more opposed to experience and truth than this notion of not prejudicing people's minds; no one in the first place does choose for himself (so far as a rational choice is concerned) who is left to the casual impulses or persuasions which he may receive in after-life. But what is most material to observe is, that this is not the order of Providence. Mankind are sent into the world by God's providence greatly dependent on one another throughout—each generation on that which precedes it for its state of knowledge, its civilisation, its morality, and its religion: the child on the parent, one class of society on another, the poor in general on the rich, not only for the necessaries and comforts of life, but even for the things necessary unto godliness, as for instruction, discipline, and example. And if in the mysterious dispensations of Providence, one generation, or one class, neglects to perform its duties towards those

thus made dependent on it, the evil is sure to be felt by those whom they have so neglected. And this is a plain admonition to us from God Himself that we, the elders in the world, are under a sacred obligation to take care of the young—not only of their bodies, but of their souls; to provide for them sound moral and religious instruction and training, as much as for their earthly good, and more even for the former; inasmuch as the neglect is of more serious and lasting consequence to the individuals as well as also to the succeeding generation. To leave them accordingly *without prejudices* (as it is said), but without, in truth, the best instruction and guidance we have to give them, is to leave them—not as God would have them left—without that advantage and help which they have a right to expect from us. Would we give them that advantage and help, therefore, we are bound, I consider, to provide schools for our poor neighbours, where their children may profit by that superior knowledge and attainment of moral and religious truth, which our superior position and advantages have enabled us to acquire, and to impart of our abundance to those that need.

. . . . . .

'When I speak of our duty of teaching our children the doctrines and principles of our Church, I am not intending to disparage the profession of those who dissent from us; nor do I mean to require that those who differ from us on any points of importance should sacrifice their conscientious convictions to ours. When I recollect what excellent men have belonged to the rank of Non-conformists—such as Baxter, and Doddridge, and Watts; when I look even to many in our own times who adorn the sects to which they belong, by their learning and their faithfulness, I cannot presume to throw a slight on any who conscientiously dissent from our communion. But, at the same time, we, as honest and faithful men in our posts (happily united together in upholding the doctrines

which our own Church teaches), cannot but teach her doctrines in sincerity.'*

As a public speaker, the Bishop's consciousness and shyness prevented his being as effective as his natural advantages of quickness and memory, and his abundant information, would otherwise have made him. Besides, the very rapidity with which ideas followed in succession through his mind was a difficulty. They crushed, as it were, one on the other, like the strong waves of the incoming tide; but as these, though in their impetuosity they seem to destroy each other, still bring in the sea, so the thoughts he desired to bring before the minds of his hearers were made to stand forth distinctly; though, it may be, a hurry and an anxiety in expression would mar in some degree the immediate effect upon the listener.

As this chapter relates chiefly to his exertions in the cause of education in the diocese, a passage in his first Charge, delivered in 1850, in which he refers especially to this subject, may be given in further illustration of his views upon it. 'For some years past,' he said, 'the great question of the education of the poor has been acquiring an increased importance, and an intensity of interest, from the theological aspect in which it has been studiously presented. It has been made a question as between the Church and infidelity,—as if all who did not advocate an exclusively Church-education were consciously, or unconsciously, aiding the cause of infidelity. Now this I regard as an unfair statement of the question. Undoubtedly the faithful member of the Church would desire, and strive by all lawful means, that every child should be brought up in the sound faith, and attached to the Church, by being early trained in its holy discipline, and in grateful remembrance of its blessings to them as their nursing mother in Christ. As we would have all

* Speech at Hereford Diocesan Meeting in the Shire Hall, December 15, 1849.

baptised in the Church, so would we have the seeds of grace, implanted in them at that period, watered and nourished by the care of the Church. Such must be our theory and our practice κατ' εὐχήν. But what are the facts we have to deal with? The education of the poor has been too long neglected. Our churches and our ministers have not sufficed for the growth of the population. Consequently, the religious feeling of the country, as might have been expected in the inadequacy of the regular provisions for its guidance, has wandered into strange and unauthorised forms of belief and profession; whilst a large mass of the people, especially in the great towns, have been scattered, as sheep without a shepherd, without faith and without worship. Many children have not been baptised in the Church—have never had those sponsions made for them which the instructions of the Church Catechism presuppose. How are we to reach these outcasts, as it were, surrounding us on all sides, having no sympathy with us, no appreciation of the Church as a holy institution of Christ? They are not disposed to receive us as ambassadors of Christ. There are teachers risen up among them disclaiming our authority. How then, in such circumstances, can we insist against them on our high prerogative, of being the sole authorised teachers of the people; when it must exclude so many from the advantages of the instruction—when, unless we receive them, they must be thrown into other hands and lost to the Church? Such being the case, it appears to me, that we ought readily and thankfully to avail ourselves of the help proffered to us by the Government in carrying on the education of the poor, though it may not leave us entirely free as to the management of our schools. Thankful, indeed, we should rather be, that so slight a restriction has been imposed on the acceptance of any grant from the Council of Education, as that embodied in the well-known "management clauses"—a restriction,

which leaves the spiritual instructions and effectual superintendence of the school in the hands of the ministers of the Church exclusively.'*

At a later period, in reverting, in a letter, to some comments in the 'Globe' newspaper on a speech of his at the yearly meeting of the Diocesan Education Society in 1854, he says, 'They are very unfair;' and adds, 'What the "Times" said was all well enough in maintaining their own position, which I had attacked. But the former (the "Globe") entirely misrepresented me. I have no objection to the secular instruction of the people. I would carry it, on the contrary, to the utmost attainable point; but without religious instruction and training combined, it is not *education*.'

* *Charge* delivered in 1850, 2nd edition, p. 38.

CHAPTER XVII.

1850.

RE-OPENING OF HEREFORD CATHEDRAL FOR DIVINE SERVICE—RESTORATION —BISHOP HAMPDEN'S VIEWS AS TO CHORAL SERVICES—SERVICES AT ST. BARNABAS, PIMLICO—DEATH OF HIS ELDEST DAUGHTER — OXFORD UNIVERSITY COMMISSION — THE GORHAM CASE — VISIT TO THE ISLE OF WIGHT—THE 'PAPAL AGGRESSION.'

DURING many years previous to Bishop Hampden's entry upon the diocese, the beautiful Cathedral of Hereford had been closed for restoration. This he felt to be so objectionable, that he insisted by every means in his power that it should be so arranged that some portion, at least, of the sacred building might be available for Divine service. This was accomplished in 1850, when the nave was temporarily fitted up for public worship. The restoration was at last completed, and the cathedral in its present state re-opened in 1863. But it was for the first re-opening that he was especially concerned—that there should not be silence within the walls dedicated to praise and prayer.

As regards the full choral service, he for his part, delighted in it, but he did not urge its general adoption. In the case of village churches, especially where the chanting of the Psalms would be objected to by some persons as a novelty, or be felt by the congregation to be an interruption to their devotions, from the difficulty some persons find in following the chanting, his advice was always against attempting this mode of celebrating Divine service; and he held that in no case should it be attempted, unless the general efficiency of the choir for its seemly performance could be depended on. Referring to a newly-erected church, in which the extravagant innovations more

recently imported into Church services had been adopted, and at that time attracted much attention, he says in a letter:—'The proceedings at St. Barnabas Church, and the phraseology about them, are to my mind very offensive. I see nothing reverent in them, but rather a profane levelling of religion and its ordinances to be a pastime for the many, especially the female world, and the glorification of a few individuals, the chief actors.'

A passage in his Primary Charge describes more fully his views on this subject:—'As to the observance of the rites and ceremonies of the Church, how can he who regards his office as that of a representative of his Lord, be indifferent and careless about anything belonging to the Divine service? He knows, indeed, that the Gospel is not a religion of ceremonial and type, like the law. Still he will not undervalue those venerable forms which the Church has received and retained, whilst it rejected the mass of vain and superstitious ceremonies, with which the simple worship of the Christian temple had been overlaid and defaced. Nor will he take upon him to alter them at his discretion, whether by addition or omission; when he remembers that, though the first institution of a ceremony be arbitrary—though in theory it be changeable—yet in practice the ceremonial of religion becomes closely connected with its doctrines, and expressive of them; and that it was in fact through the ceremonial, chiefly, that the great corruptions of doctrine, in the middle ages, were insinuated into the minds of men and recommended. He will take care, therefore, amidst his observance of those forms which the Church has retained, how he introduces anything, which, though seemingly insignificant in itself, is part of that system which the Reformers cut away, and which tends, as experience shows, to destroy the simplicity, first of Christian worship, and then of Christian faith.'*

* *Charge* delivered in 1850, 2nd edition, p. 20.

When the Deanery of Hereford became vacant in 1850, he was anxious that the new Dean should be 'something of a cathedral man,' who would be interested in, and aid in, the restoration of the fabric; and also take an interest in rendering the choir more effective; and in a letter about this time, he thus wrote :—'We have the nave very nicely arranged for the daily service; but there is much to be done, requiring a man's help in it who will have his heart in the work.'* It is true that he expressed some regret when he heard that his old and much-loved friend, Lord Saye and Sele, had declined the offer of the deanery. 'I suppose,' he says, 'the amount of residence required (eight months) deterred him; conscientious man as he is, he would not engage in the duty without strictly complying with its requisitions.' He was, however, glad to hear of the appointment of Mr. Dawes, on public grounds, for he was then personally unacquainted with him. In a letter at the time he spoke of him as 'the great education man from King's Sombourn;' and added, 'no doubt he will be very useful in carrying out our education scheme, both in the city and diocese.'

His letters in the spring of 1850 are many of them written under great depression of spirits. A great sorrow had fallen on himself and Mrs. Hampden, and all his home circle, in the death of his eldest surviving daughter. The illness, which resulted in her death, had increased rapidly, and to this painful anxiety was added the work of the Trinity ordination, which could not be postponed But in the midst of this great trouble, he went through his duty, distressing as he found it to be; and although she did not breathe her last until after the day of the ordination, the strain of nerve was very great, and it

* This wish was fully carried out by Dr. Dawes, as Dean of Hereford, to whose practical ability and energy, and unceasing interest in the Cathedral, and all concerning it, it was chiefly due that the Cathedral and the Close were so beautifully restored and completed.

was some time before he rallied his health and strength. He was anxious, moreover, on account of Mrs. Hampden, whose health never quite recovered the shock of her daughter's death. 'It will be long indeed,' he writes to Mr. Hayward Cox, 'before poor Mrs. Hampden recovers at all from this heavy blow. Our dear departed child was so wound up with all our home feelings, that we cannot be reconciled to her loss, though for her pure spirit heaven was a fitter place than our society. It is, indeed, amidst the pain, great consolation to think of her.' Of himself he writes:—'I have not felt courage yet to go to the House of Lords: I have been so depressed in spirits and unequal to exertion. On Sunday next, however, I have promised to preach a charity sermon at Hoxton, and I shall go, perhaps, after that.'

The appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the state of the University of Oxford, was regarded by him with great satisfaction. He especially mentions the pleasure with which he had read 'Prince Albert's admirable letter' on the subject.

Reference is made in his letters at this time to the excitement as to the Gorham case; and he mentions that addresses had been presented to him on the subject, adding, 'I hope this diocese will remain quiet. Such is the counsel of my answers.' In his Charge delivered in the autumn of 1850, he reverts to this subject; and it is evident that the 'quiet' of his 'counsels' was not the quiet of indifference, but 'the keeping aloof from that kind of agitation, of which there had been,' he says, 'so much in other places.' He states further, in addressing the clergy of his diocese, 'it is a great satisfaction to me to be assured that, whilst you have not been wanting in that concern, which faithful ministers of Christ must feel for the sacred deposit of the faith committed to them, and for the Church its keeper and witness, in times of perplexity and fear, your anxiety has been only duly

evinced; you have not exceeded the limits of that authority in which you have been placed, as stewards in the household of Christ—as watchmen looking from their watch-tower against the approach of the enemy—as shepherds caring for the flock which the Lord has appointed them to keep and to feed.'*

On the occasion of his first Visitation, one new place, Bridgnorth, was added to those visited by his predecessor, and he speaks of his intention on future occasions to introduce other towns, in order to prevent the inconvenience of long journeys to the clergy.

After the Visitation he joined Mrs. Hampden and his family at Bonchurch, Isle of Wight, where they had gone for the benefit of sea-air and change. His partiality for the scenery of the Isle of Wight has been already mentioned. It was a great refreshment and relief to him, worn as he was, with exertions made under depression of spirits, to walk and ride along the delightful Undercliff. He also visited Shanklin, and the cottage where he had read for his degree, which he found transformed into an inn. His family and himself received much kindness from families resident there. 'We are,' he writes, 'much pleased with the scenery; the sea alone is a great change to us. We have indeed found all the people here kind and agreeable, though we have remained quite retired amongst them, having come here for the very purpose of being quiet.'

He passed through London on his way home in November, when the 'Papal Aggression' had just been announced, and the general feeling of indignation was strongly expressed. On this subject he thus writes:—'As to this aggression of the Pope, it is no doubt the doing of the apostates from ourselves. . . . They mean, by it, to replace themselves in that importance which they have

* *Charge*, 2nd edition, p. 13.

lost by going over to a dissenting body. But they will find they have made a wrong move. They have roused the Protestant feeling of the country, which will do more against them than their friends can do for them. I think we ought to resist the Pope's proceeding, and with all our might. For whoever may be the authors of it, it is most insolent in itself, and an invasion of the Royal Supremacy. There will be a stir, I have no doubt, among the Hereford clergy. I have already heard, indeed, from Shropshire on the subject.' Again he writes:—'The work of resistance to the Pope (I don't see why they speak of him so much as the Bishop of Rome) and his Cardinal is going on well. What a glorious letter that is of Lord John Russell's! Tractarianism has never had such a blow yet. It is only to be feared that the popular fury will go too far, and occasion some little reaction in favour of the delinquents. I shall stay over to-morrow, and go down into the city, where the feeling is strong, to hear what is going on. On Wednesday we return to the palace.' At the conclusion of this letter he gives an account of a somewhat curious incident. 'What do you think of ——'s crossing over to me in the street, and asking my forgiveness for having voted against me, and declaring his repentance? It was insolent enough, you will say, when you hear on what grounds. He had now, he said, joined another communion, and he was convinced that I was only the proper representative of the communion to which I belonged, and he was wrong, therefore, in opposing me. I merely told him I appreciated his motive, but regretted he had left our communion.'

The clergy of the diocese were received by Bishop Hampden at all times, as far as his public duty allowed him. He most readily advised with them in all things, great or small, that concerned their parochial duties. The amount of correspondence on diocesan matters was

enormous. And the fatigue of this was by no means lessened by the fact that many of the letters received and answered were on comparatively small matters, for all of them were such as to demand more or less thought and inquiry. By this means much general guidance and instruction was conveyed; producing, although the agency might be little perceived, a large amount of good. He never consulted his own convenience, nor, indeed, his health. In this respect, a naturally strong constitution had made him far too neglectful. He would often remain in his library despatching letters and other business until the daylight had failed him, and he was too wearied in mind and body to take needful exercise, and a few turns on the garden terrace would be his only relaxation for the day.

CHAPTER XVIII.

OBJECTS AIMED AT IN BISHOP HAMPDEN'S CHARGES AND ADDRESSES—VIEWS AS TO REVIVAL OF CONVOCATION—CHARACTER OF THE TEACHING IN HIS CHARGES AND SERMONS—LETTER FROM THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE.

In his more general teaching, such as his Charges and addresses at the public meetings of religious societies, he studied to guide and instruct the clergy and others on the questions which had been brought into prominent discussion, and pressed on their attention at the time. He also directed their notice to the advantage of studying the bearing of historical evidence on all such questions; and he referred them to the great writers on such subjects, of whose research they ought to avail themselves in forming their judgment. He also endeavoured to quiet the alarm felt by many, at the aspect of affairs in regard to the Church, and to encourage a brave trust in her future from the experience of her past triumphs over the like troubles and anxieties. 'I believe,' he says, 'there is that life in the Church which will sustain her still, as it has sustained her before, through many grievous assaults and trials. I look upon the efforts that are made to overthrow her ascendency, to weaken her influence, to disparage her usefulness, or in any way counteract her operations, as signs rather, that she is felt to be working, that her antagonists are conscious that she possesses a real power, that they are stimulated to extraordinary exertion, as feeling that their own cause is declining, and that they must seek by all means the overthrow of a power of which they are become more than ever jealous. For observe, in illustration of

this, the instance of our Lord's own ministry on the earth. The activity of the rulers of the Jews against Him became more intense, as His ministry appeared to gain the greater influence with the people. Thus we read, 'Then gathered the chief priests and the Pharisees a council, and said, What do we? for this man doeth many miracles. If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him; and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.' So it is with the spirit of persecution generally. It is the fiercest and the most energetic, when those who use it feel that the cause which they advocate is in the greatest danger. It is fear in the extreme which makes the timid bold; and it makes them also fierce and cruel.' *

In addressing the clergy at his first Visitation, he expressly called their attention to the difference in one important respect between the Church of England since the Reformation and all other Churches, inasmuch as in that Church alone is granted to the priesthood the liberty of independent thought in refuting false doctrine: 'Upon yourselves, indeed, a much greater weight of responsibility rests, as Ministers of the Reformed Church of England, in proportion to the greater charge which the Church since the Reformation has laid on those who are called to the priesthood, in these our solemn meetings for mutual counsel and edification. The Ministers of our Reformed Church, whilst they are taught to seek godly admonition and counsel from their Bishop, and to render him due obedience in all lawful commands, are also themselves commissioned to study the Scriptures for themselves, and out of them to instruct the people entrusted to their charge. And among other solemn pledges which they are required to give at their ordination to the Priesthood, is that very remarkable one, that they will "banish and drive away all erroneous and strange

* *Charge* delivered in 1853, p. 2.

doctrines, contrary to God's word;" implying, that they are themselves to be men of sound judgment,—whilst vigilant at their post to observe whatever errors may arise in the Church, capable of dealing with it as the occasion requires—of refuting false doctrine, and establishing the truth, by sound argument and persuasion, and faithful teaching from the Scriptures. I call this a very remarkable injunction of the Service for the Ordination of Priests; because, in no other Church is the like commission given to any other but to the highest order of the Ministry, the Bishops of the Church exclusively. Neither in the Greek forms of ordination, nor in the Roman Pontifical, do we find any such charge given to the Ministers of the inferior orders, but only to the Bishops. All that is exacted of the Priest and the Deacon, according to the formularies of the Greek and Roman Churches, is the promise of obedience to the Bishop, to whom entirely they are to look for direction and instruction, both as to their faith and their conduct; an absolute and summary power being vested in the Bishop to restrain and censure them at his discretion. At the Reformation, accordingly, a great change was introduced in this respect. It was found that under the previous system, the mass of the clergy throughout the country were incapable of instructing the people. It was rare to find any, as appears even from the Canons of our Church, who could preach to the people. The mass of the clergy, as would be the natural effect of the system to which they belonged, were intellectually and morally degraded by the very exclusion from all right of judgment by the terms of their ordination, and subjected to an arbitrary dictation from the will of their Superior. The Reformation corrected this evil. It transferred to the Priests of the Church some of that power of judgment and action, which had before been reserved entirely to the Bishop. Whereas, in the Roman Pontifical, the Bishop alone is examined

as to the point, whether he will instruct the people in the Christian doctrine according to the Holy Scriptures; the question is with us asked also of the candidate for the Priesthood; and, in accordance with this, follow the other questions to which I have before referred, carrying out and enforcing the primary one;—all implying, that those who are admitted to that sacred function amongst us, should be men of counsel and judgment; not such as blindly to follow the guidance of their Superior, or one of their own order, but capable of appreciating in their own minds, and exercising a sound and enlightened discretion on, any counsel that may be given them. It is true, this power is limited to their own immediate sphere of duty, so far as it is a power of acting with authority against error; as is evident from that express reference which is made in the Ordination Service to the place in which the Minister is to exercise it. "Within your cures," it is said, in the question itself in which the candidate is examined on that head. And this is precisely that exercise of counsel and judgment on your part, which such occasions as the present seem to demand of you. As prudent men, as faithful pastors in your own parishes, as conversant by experience with the working of the Gospel, and the teaching of its holy truths, and the various forms of misbelief, or unbelief, or slighting in practice, with which it is assailed there, you will be able to judge better, both generally of the advice which I may give you, and how to adapt it to your own circumstances.*

Although he strongly advocated combined action among the clergy, in the form of meetings and associations for the purpose of mutual consultation and advice, whether on matters incidental to their holy calling, or important to the Church at large, he did not desire to see the revival of Convocation. 'A Synod must,' he says, 'essen-

* *Charge* delivered in 1850, second edition, p. 6.

tially differ from these associations and meetings to which I have referred, inasmuch as it must be representative. This circumstance at once changes the character and proceedings of an assembly. It is no longer a meeting of persons in their individual capacity, but as the representatives of certain principles and parties and interests. The questions brought under discussion before an assembly so constituted, must also assume a corresponding difference of character, according to the elements of which it is composed; and party interests and feelings must necessarily enter into them and influence the deliberations.'*

In the same Charge, he made also the following remarks upon the subject of Convocation:—

'It has been urged by able advocates, that the suspension of the synodical action of the Church has been the chief occasion of those divisions and defections which we painfully witness at this day; and that the effectual remedy for these evils, consequently, would be to restore to the Church that liberty of deliberation, of which it has been so long, and so injuriously, as they contend, deprived. For my part, I do not agree in this opinion. Did it appear, from examination of the case, that the Church was exempt from such evils, at the time when it enjoyed this liberty of deliberation, and that it has only declined in spiritual energy and vitality since it has been denied that liberty, there might then be good reason to contend for the restoration of it. But the contrary, I am convinced, will rather be found to be the case.' After a review of the general state of religion and morality previous to 1717, when Convocation was silenced, he continues: 'What I wish to be observed, then is, not that the activity of Convocation is to bear the blame of all this evil, but that it was no remedy for it. It did not maintain the ascendancy of the Church and of religious principle; it did not throw

* *Charge* delivered in 1853, p. 31.

oil on the troubled waters, or abate the spirit of nonconformity; but rather it worked the contrary. It only exasperated the strife; turning the arms of the parties in the Church against one another; exhibiting, as it were, a gladiatorial spectacle to the world of combatants implacably fighting to the death, rather than of Christians earnestly contending for the truth which is peace and love.'*

Dr. Hampden's Charges and sermons as Bishop of Hereford bear witness to the fulness of his Christian teaching. The same may be justly claimed for all his writings, for in them no variation can be traced between the doctrines or opinions maintained in his earliest and in his latest works. The difference that naturally does exist is one which is generally recognised in the following letter—the difference between an inquiry directed to a particular branch of theological study, and brought before a learned University, and the more comprehensive and practical teaching necessary in a parish or a diocese.

The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone to Bishop Hampden.

Hawarden, Chester: November 9, 1856.

My Lord Bishop,—Your lordship will probably be surprised at receiving a letter from me, as a stranger. The simple purpose of it is to discharge a debt of the smallest possible importance to you, yet due I think from me, by expressing the regret with which I now look back on my concurrence in a vote of the University of Oxford in the year 1836, condemnatory of some of your lordship's publications. I did not take actual part in the vote; but upon reference to a journal kept at the time, I find that my absence was owing to an accident.

For a good many years past I have found myself ill able to master books of an abstract character, and I am far from

* *Charge*, pp. 13, 22.

pretending to be competent at this time to form a judgment on the merits of any propositions then at issue.

I have learned, indeed, that many things which, in the forward precipitancy of my youth, I should have condemned, are either in reality sound, or lie within the just limits of such discussion as especially befits an University. But that which (after a delay, due, I think, to the cares and pressing occupations of political life) brought back to my mind the injustice of which I had unconsciously been guilty in 1836, was my being called upon, as a member of the Council of King's College in London, to concur in a measure similar in principle with respect to Mr. Maurice; that is to say, in a condemnation couched in general terms which did not really declare the point of imputed guilt, and against which perfect innocence could have no defence. I resisted to the best of my power, though ineffectually, the grievous wrong done to Mr. Maurice, and urged that the charges should be made distinct, that all the best means of investigation should be brought to bear on them, ample opportunity given for defence, and a reference then made, if needful, to the Bishop in his proper capacity. But the majority of laymen in the Council were inexorable.

It was only, as I have said, after mature reflection that I came to perceive the bearing of the case on that of 1836, and to find that by my resistance I had condemned myself. I then lamented very sincerely that I had not on that occasion, now so remote, felt and acted in a different manner.

I beg your lordship to accept this expression of my cordial regret, and to allow me to subscribe myself, very respectfully,

Your obedient and humble servant,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

The Lord Bishop of Hereford.

CHAPTER XIX.

CHRISTMAS, 1861—THE PRINCE CONSORT'S DEATH—SERMON IN HEREFORD CATHEDRAL—BISHOP HAMPDEN IN THE PULPIT—HIS DISTRIBUTION OF PATRONAGE—INFLUENCE ON CLERGY OF DIOCESE—REMARKS BY ARCHDEACON WARING—NEW CHURCHES—CONSTRUCTION OF CHURCHES—THE BAPTISMAL SERVICE—REGARD FOR CHILDREN—LETTER TO CHILD.

BISHOP HAMPDEN was called upon to preach in the cathedral of his diocese on the Christmas morning of the year 1861—the Christmas that followed so closely upon the death of the Prince Consort. At Christmas-time, when the scattered members of families so often reassemble in their old homes, and when the blank left by those absent ones, who will no more return there, is the more painfully felt, the thoughts of all could not but turn to that sorrowing household whose chief had been removed from their sight, and to the nation's part in that sorrow.

The character of the Prince was, in its moral and intellectual greatness, one to excite the Bishop's sympathy and affection as well as his respect and admiration. But it was on other grounds that he desired to turn the attention of those whom he addressed on that Christmas morning to the example which the Prince had held up to the country. 'It will belong,' he said, 'rather to the historian of the times to describe his public virtues, how his bearing was one of wisdom and impartiality and benevolence to all, how entirely he identified himself with his adopted country, how he studied to promote, by his active leading and co-operation, whatever might tend to the civilization and the welfare of the country, whether

in agriculture, or commerce, or arts, or civil and religious institutions. In fact, he sought not fame but real usefulness in all he did; being ever ready to give his time, his talents, his interest, and his money to any cause that was recommended to his notice by its sound and practical character of usefulness. And so, as associated with the Sovereign as her Consort, in all her cares and anxieties, we have reason to believe that he so acted in counsel with her throughout, as to strengthen and support her own excellent judgment, and impart to her the assurance that, with his concurrence, she should carry along with her, for her public measures, the approval also of the majority of candid, independent judgments of her people. But,' he continued, 'what I feel called upon more distinctly to notice from this place is the domestic example of his life; how he shone as a husband and a father, holding up a light to even the humblest, as well as the greatest, home throughout the country, and from the eminence in which that example was placed, even to a still wider horizon beyond it; and so witnessing to the holy obligations of the married state. Happy indeed was that marriage—one, not formed by considerations of state expediency or on any other ground but that of mutual love. And so it subsisted in love, until that moment when it pleased Almighty God, in the mysterious course of His Providence over nations and individuals, to put an end to it on earth, and remove that bright example from our eyes. As Englishmen, we pride ourselves, and justly so, in our domestic life, in our families and our houses, as the scene of our chief happiness in the world. How highly, then, must we not estimate the blessing of that example. How deeply must we lament the loss of him who made himself so entirely the brother and friend of us all, and one with us all; even of those of the humblest degree among us, by the virtues and the tender charities of his private life in the bosom of his family. What

concord, and peace, and blessedness would be found in the cottage of the poorest labourer in the land, if there were found also there that true conjugal affection, that united consideration for each other, that concern for their children's nurture in truth and virtue in its humble inmates, which constituted the charm and grace of this household of the chief in station and honour amongst us.'*

The Bishop's manner in preaching was quiet, but simple and natural, never degenerating into the 'very familiar;' which, to his taste, was always objectionable, whether in preaching or in reading the service. His voice was thoroughly pure-toned and distinct, alike free from the growl of defiance, or the penitential whine, not infrequently met with; nor was there the painful picking out and squeezing of words sometimes practised, as if an effort were being made to wring from the one word the sense it had to express in conjunction with others. The effort, moreover, which he made to overcome his natural shyness rather increased than lessened the effect of his preaching, by giving more animation to the voice and eye.

It was his practice to study the composition of his sermons, more especially those addressed to a general congregation; and the result was that his hearers followed and also remembered them easily. It is almost remarkable after how long periods of time some of them, though unpublished, have been well remembered, and reference has been made to them.

The distribution of the patronage of the see was by no means the least anxious or easy of his duties. The following letter, written to a clergyman of the diocese, containing the offer of a living, expresses his anxiety in this matter, and the rule which he laid down to himself with

* From an unpublished sermon preached in Hereford cathedral on Christmas day, 1861.

regard to it—a rule to which he adhered most scrupulously:—

The disposal of the patronage of the see is in every case to me a matter of much serious thought and great anxiety. I make it a rule with myself to set aside all solicitations of friends and personal feelings, as far as possible, and every consideration, in fact, except what is best for the parish itself, and who is likely to perform its duties faithfully and diligently—bearing in mind that it is not one person or one family that is to be provided for, but the good, both temporal and spiritual, of many. It is under these convictions, and as feeling that you will fully appreciate them, that I now have the satisfaction of proposing to you to undertake a weightier charge than that which you have hitherto held in the diocese, in offering to you the living of ———. I have every reason to believe that you have justified this preference by your conduct in your present sphere of duty, and more especially lately by your exertions in behalf of the great cause* on which we met at Crawley the other evening. I can fully trust, therefore, that if you accept this offer, you will do so in the like spirit to that in which it is made to you—not for your own sake exclusively or chiefly, though every faithful labourer justly earns his reward, but for the benefit of the souls that will be entrusted to you, and the edification of the Church.

With reference to the unsuccessful candidates for church preferment, he says 'it is indeed a painful circumstance in the disposal of such patronage. But there must be always some pain in these cases, where *one* only can be taken, whilst several deserving men must be passed over.' †

If outward signs may be trusted, Bishop Hampden's ministry, as chief pastor, among those committed to his care, was blessed to their edification; for while earnestness of purpose and active self-devotion increased in every part of his diocese, there was no excitement or exaggera-

* The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

† Letter to Thomas Evans, Esq., the Bishop's Secretary.

tion of sentiment—the making of 'religion a beautiful abstraction for the imagination, or a thought of rest for the wayward heart; using it for a luxury of thought and feeling, instead of receiving it in its positive reality, as a doctrine of sober truth though full of mystery, and a homely discipline of life and conduct.*'

The following remarks, from the pen of Archdeacon Waring, of Salop, may be not inappropriately inserted here. 'The kindness of Bishop Hampden was fully appreciated by the clergy. He was always ready to listen to any appeal for a reasonable indulgence, and showed a deep sympathy with those who by illness or any other accident were prevented from discharging their parochial duties. On one occasion, in a large gathering of the clergy, an allusion to this peculiar feature found a ready response in the hearts of all who were present.

'With kindness was combined great firmness, more especially in requiring two services on the Lord's Day, whenever the second service could be legally enforced. When, on one occasion, an exchange had been carried out upon the understanding that one service would only be required, the Bishop at once refused to give his sanction to such an arrangement, and at the same time expressed a kind feeling towards the incumbent who had been induced to entertain so erroneous an impression His motive for separating two parishes which had been previously united was expressed in the following words: "I shall then secure two services in each church."

'It so happened that during the controversy respecting Bishop Colenso, we travelled together in the same railway carriage from Shrewsbury to Ludlow. The whole conversation had reference to that topic, combined with a strong desire on the part of the Bishop to issue a pastoral letter

* *University Sermons*, p. 273.

to his clergy. It seemed to me that great caution was necessary in adopting such a course, as much had been written which, from the severity of its tone, was rather calculated to damage than promote the cause which the writers had in view. The letter was issued, and very generally approved of, combining as it did a clear refutation of error with an absence of bitterness of expression. The clergy had the advantage of ascertaining the Bishop's views at so important a crisis, and at the same time were reminded of the spirit in which subjects of controversy should be treated.*

'On one occasion an incumbent of great piety and zeal for his work wrote to me to inquire whether a pastoral staff, for which a large sum had been promised, would be acceptable to the Bishop. Without the slightest hesitation, on behalf of the Bishop I declined the offer. In stating the circumstance to the Bishop there was on his part an unusual anxiety to be acquainted with my decision; upon hearing it, he fully concurred in its propriety. In fact, there was no need of any outward symbol to heighten the dignity of manner which seemed so natural in him. At the same time, he was so simple, so humble, in his habits, that strangers would hardly give him credit for his great ability and the extensive knowledge he possessed.'

A few words addressed to a clergyman of the diocese* who had given him the sad intelligence of the death of a brother clergyman, evinces not only his kindly sympathy, but his knowledge of the individual character of the clergy under his care. 'I am sorry indeed to hear of the death of so good and kind a man as Mr. Holland of Stoke Bliss. Such men keep up the tradition among us of the truly worthy and respectable clergy of a former day—the bright

* Some account of this letter will be found in Chapter XXII., pp. 230-232.

† The Rev. H. T. Hill, Rector of Felton.

spots, amidst the many cases of shortcoming or delinquency, which the great improvement of the body in these times naturally brings before our view, as we look back and draw the contrast, as we happily can do, in favour of the present age.'

It was a matter of rejoicing to him when he was summoned to the consecration of a new church.* During his episcopate, there were many such occasions, in addition to numerous restorations. To all such works (except of course when the funds were provided by individual munificence) he contributed liberally. Besides the great importance he attached to church building, as a work of Christian piety and devotion, his interest in the actual building was great; and his knowledge and taste in architecture, especially ecclesiastical architecture, were considerable. When consulted as to plans, he insisted strongly on two points—namely, that the building should be advantageously placed on the ground, and that the walls should be of sufficient thickness to give impressiveness and solidity to the building: not that he was indifferent to or disliked finish or decoration, but he considered no ornament of value if the solidity which gives the true dignity to the structure be wanting. His feeling with regard to the fabric was in keeping with what he desired to see in the celebration of the services within—that adornment which interests the devout thought and keeps it intent on the purposes for which a church is built. Further, he had a great dislike to even harmless shams, such as one wood or marble painted in imitation of another; and in Ewelme church, and other places where he was individually concerned, he removed the painted wood and substituted real oak in its stead.

It would be an omission not to mention the peculiar

* He always required that there should be some endowment provided for a clergyman before he consented to consecrate a church.

interest he felt in officiating in the Baptismal Service. On one occasion, he was requested to baptise an infant immediately after the consecration of a church—the child of the munificent founder of the church. It seemed to him (he said) the most fitting conclusion to the service of the consecration, as he held the infant in his arms and all around prayed with him, 'that he might lead the rest of his life according to that beginning.' As an expression of his fondness for young children, a letter is appended, written some years ago to one of his favourite little friends—the young daughter of the Rev. E. B. Hawkshaw, who, in kindly lending it for insertion here, says, with great truth, 'It is very characteristic of his playfulness of manner with children, which made them so fond of him':—

My dear Catherine,—If you were pleased with the maps, how must I be pleased with so nice a little letter as that you have written to me to thank me for them, and with the kind remembrance of so nice a little friend. When I see you again, I dare say you will be able to tell me a great deal about the countries you will have travelled over, and the places you will have seen, all the while that you have been at home.

Pray say to Edith and Lucy for me, that, though I address this letter to you, to whom it is more especially due, I am thinking of them also at the same time, and that I send my love to them as well as to you, and that I hope to see you all again here soon, and to hear you sing another pretty song together.

I remain, yours affectionately,
R. D. Hereford.

In a few words of congratulation addressed to his sister, Mrs. Robert King, on the birth of a grand-child, he says: 'I must not delay to congratulate you on the birth of a grand-child, and your accession of importance in the world in consequence of that event. You take a great interest, I know, in little children. So far, I can enter

into your feelings about having an infant to look after, and to nurse, and take care of. For I always liked my children best when they were little ones, and was sorry when they got too big and too heavy to be taken up in the arms and nursed.'

CHAPTER XX.

1862.

EXTRACT FROM UNPUBLISHED CHARGE—'MYTHICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE FACTS OF THE GOSPEL.'

THE following extract from an unpublished Charge, delivered in 1862, is given here at some length, in consideration of the subject being one of particular interest in the theological discussions of modern times—the Mythical Interpretation of the Recorded Facts of the Gospel. It had been the Bishop's intention, in accordance with several requests which he had received, to make considerable additions to the Charge, and for this reason it was not published at the time. That intention he never relinquished, although the more pressing calls upon his attention forced him to postpone its fulfilment. There are many references and notes among his papers which show the importance he attached to the subject, and his intention of further pursuing it:—

'I have already referred to the controversies of more recent date, those in which the freedom of discussion on religious subjects had been carried to the utmost license. How triumphantly the attacks on our most holy faith were met and repelled by its advocates in that day of its trial, is sufficiently shown by the silence and oblivion into which the writings of authors once enjoying considerable celebrity—such as Bolingbroke, and Shaftesbury, and Chubb, and Toland, and Tyndale—have long fallen. We, most of us, are content in these days with such acquaintance with them as may be obtained indirectly, from reading that masterly refutation of their principal heads of objection in the several chapters of the well-known

"Analogy" of Bishop Butler—the work to which, more than to any other, we owe the establishment of the truth of our religion, on the ground of its perfect accordance with the general principles obtained by experience and observation of the facts respecting the natural and moral government of God in the world.

'But though these attempts are passed away and forgotten, it cannot be said that together with them all assaults of a similar bearing and tendency have ceased, or have been anticipated and encountered in the resistance to these. These consisted chiefly of speculative objections and difficulties. This or that point in the Christian revelation was cavilled at. It was objected, for instance, that the Christian revelation was miraculous—that the light of nature, or natural religion, was sufficient—that it set forth examples of conduct inconsistent with our moral sentiments—that its scheme of mediation and atonement by the sufferings of Christ was incredible, and the like. Its assailants then vainly hoped that it might be laughed out of the world. And they endeavoured, accordingly, to insinuate a suspicion and doubt in the minds of people, whether there could be any real ground for their belief, which, coinciding with the practical unbelief of many in that day, might by an easy transition become also a speculative unbelief and rejection of the truth. They reckoned on the prevailing irreverence of the times. Then, there was no such thing as Biblical criticism known, or at any rate studied; no inquiry into the laws of Scripture interpretation, as in these later days; so that public attention was then naturally directed to general objections against the matter contained in the Scriptures either in the whole or its parts. But in the course of the present century, the study of criticism and interpretation has been applied to the Scriptures themselves, and accordingly made an opening for a different class of assaults on the truth. That feeling of irreverence,

again, to which the former assailants appealed, has happily disappeared from among us. No one would hope now to succeed in recommending his own views to general acceptance who should profess to be actuated by any other feeling than that of the fullest reverence for the sacred volume which he undertakes to criticise, and for the truths which it unfolds. It is to reform old-fashioned notions (as they are considered) of the Scriptures themselves, that the modern efforts have been directed; and to remove the difficulties and offences arising from the established method of interpretation, unsuited (as it is said) to the present state of education of many highly cultivated minds, that we are now invited to begin our study of the Bible anew.

'You will readily understand that I am alluding here to the neologian method of the German divines in dealing with the criticism and interpretation of the Scriptures; and in particular to that exhibition of it in a modified form which, whether consciously derived from that source, or original in the writers themselves, as following the leading of their own critical studies and speculations into the matter of Divine truth, has been brought under our notice by a publication bearing the authority of several clergymen of our Church, of great learning and ability, as well as influence by their position and character. I do not mean to say, then, that the several writers in that now well-known publication have expressly adopted that method as their own, or designedly carried it out in their disquisitions, or that they would not disclaim a great deal of what is taught in the great text-book of the Mythic School of Scripture interpretation—the "Life of Jesus" by Strauss. But I refer to the school as exemplifying, in my opinion, the tendency of speculations such as those which are put forth in the work in question *as a whole*, without imputing to any one of the authors in particular the evil tendencies to scepticism and indefinite

belief, or positive rejection of Christianity, which we cannot but attribute to the work itself in which their disquisitions are contained. The theory, then, to which, in my view, these disquisitions tend, is that the Scriptures are not to be regarded throughout as records of historical facts or accounts of real events in the history of Divine Providence and Grace, in relation to individuals and nations in the world, but legendary narratives—the whole Bible, in fact, for the most part, a parable—instructing men by fictions, by relations, whether of real or imaginary incidents, adapted to their existing circumstances and the state of knowledge and belief on successive occasions; and thus imparting to them new ideas, or general principles, abstractedly from the means—the legend, or mythical story or narrative, by which they are conveyed. The origin of such a theory has been traced up to the third century, to the example set by Origen in particular, when, in his argument with pagan unbelievers defending the strange and immoral acts which their mythology attributed to their gods, he too readily followed their proceeding in allegorizing some of the Scripture narratives to meet their objections. Origen, however, did not mean, in doing this, to treat the Scripture narratives as mere allegories and nothing more. His object was, whilst answering an opponent on his own principle, to show also a higher and more spiritual sense in the passages so interpreted—a sense beyond the letter of the revelation. Doubtless, he was thus led, as many of the Fathers after him were, to fanciful interpretations of the sacred text, and is so far justly to be condemned for his fondness for such expositions of Scripture. Still there is an allegorical use of Scripture which is just and allowable in principle: such as that application by St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, of the story of Hagar and Sarah to the illustration of the two covenants,—in which the simple historic truth of the facts so applied is

assumed, and they are not explained away or generalized, in the use thus made of them for showing the contrast between the freedom of the Gospel and the bondage of the law. The method of Scripture criticism and interpretation, however, to which I am referring, is one that takes offence at the literal understanding of the text altogether; one, that whilst it rejects equally the mystical, spiritual senses attributed by ancient interpreters to the sacred text, admits nothing in the sacred text which presents any difficulty to the critical or moral judgment, to be part of the essential revelation contained in the Bible. It would have the Bible regarded as the Gnostics of old represented the person of our Lord. As the Gnostics felt a difficulty in conceiving that our Lord should have really suffered ill-treatment and death in the body; and in the foolishness of their conceit of superior knowledge thought to remove the scandal of the Cross, the true glory of the Christian, from the profession of a faith in Christ, by denying our Lord Jesus Christ to have had a real body, and fondly asserting that the Lord, the Christ, did not suffer when the man Jesus suffered and died, but only a phantom in His form—or, as some of them explained it, only the man Jesus suffered and died, whilst the Christ was withdrawn from the earth, and suffered only in appearance; so would this theory of Biblical criticism and interpretation seek to remove the scoff of the infidel and the sceptic, by at once granting the offence of those passages of Scripture which seem irreconcilable with the critical and moral judgment, and disclaiming that offence for themselves—*i.e.* maintaining that the truth of the revelation of the Bible has nothing to do with them, that the inspiration of its writers remains unimpaired and inviolate, though the facts and the statements of events recorded in it may fall before the advance of an enlightened and more exact criticism, and though many an interpretation hitherto approved and sanctioned by high authority

and by constant ecclesiastical tradition be henceforth abandoned as untenable and unnecessary. Such, then, is the character of the mythical interpretation. It starts with the bold admission that there are many things improbable and incredible in the Bible; that we may dispense with even the accounts of miracles as evidences of a Divine mission; that we may acknowledge that alleged prophecies have not been really fulfilled; that passages of the Old Testament have been erroneously accommodated by writers in the New Testament to events to which they have no proper reference; that texts hitherto adduced in proof of certain doctrines are not applicable to them; that mistakes have been made with regard to places, and dates, and names in the Scripture accounts of transactions; that there are even contradictions in the statements of the different Evangelists,—inasmuch as the revelation made by the Bible, is, in its own nature, distinct from all such imperfection in the matter of the sacred volume. Revelation as it existed, for example, in the life and teaching of our Lord, and in His own Divine Presence when He was seen bodily in the world, and in the living preaching of the Apostles—so must it be regarded now, as independent of the Book in which it is written and the accounts therein transmitted. The Book itself may be full of unrealities, but the spirit of revelation is not tied down to the material substance with which we find it accidentally associated in our study of the Bible, but escapes from all such contagion pure and uncontaminated, as a Divine power speaking to the heart and conscience of man.

'This method of interpretation, it must be observed, goes far beyond that just concession which is made to the advanced state of physical science, when we no longer feel ourselves bound to deny the motion of the earth in order that we may not impute the charge of a mistaken statement of fact on the sacred text. The errors and blemishes over which this method would

throw its veil are not like the conclusions of science—general principles, the results of induction of instances and reasoning, but particular instances themselves; such as the assertion of the accomplishment of a particular prediction, when that prediction was not, in fact, accomplished, statements of matters of fact at variance with those of profane history touching the same events, and the like. It is evident that there is a great difference in the two classes of erroneous statements: those relating to general facts or conclusions open to continual correction and enlargement from increased experience and observation in successive ages, from the action of various minds and more extended communication among men—in reference to such, persons will, of course, naturally speak according to the condition of scientific knowledge at their time, and no incorrectness of statement can accordingly be imputed to them as to such; they are in accordance with the state of things in their time: in reference to such things they speak and act as other men then living would speak and act. But in positive facts which have their definite place in history, no contradictory statements can be admitted, without casting doubt and suspicion on the author, and without involving the necessity of reconciling the disagreement, which may, after all, on strict examination, be found to be only apparent and not real.

'Accounts of miracles may indeed seem to come under the former head, so far as the statement of a miracle may seem to imply the acknowledgment of a law of nature different from the effect alleged in that miracle. What, accordingly, would be held to be miraculous in one age would be no longer held to be so when an enlarged study of the laws of nature might bring that particular fact under some general principle not previously known. But such an observation does not apply to the case of the Scripture miracles, which are not given as explanations

of the events related in them according to the laws of nature then known, but as simple events out of the course of those laws, particular instances of exception to those laws, and of course presupposing those laws from which they are exceptions, according to the then state of knowledge, resting on the testimony of the inspired writer who records them as exceptions. Whatever might have been the state of physical science at the time when the inspired writer composed his narrative, we must believe, if we only accept his testimony, that he would nevertheless have stated what he states to have been a miracle, *as such*, for he is simply stating in each instance an effect produced at that moment; and if we reject, therefore, the account of that particular miracle, whatever it may be, we cannot explain it away on the ground of his ignorance of physical laws with which we are acquainted in these times, for he does not attempt to explain it; he merely says that a wonderful effect took place; and we, in that case, must reject his testimony altogether as false, as stating a particular event to have taken place which did not take place. Yet such is the view which has been proposed in the argument of the particular Essay which treats of the miracles of the Gospel. We may believe, according to that argument, the miracles, as they are among the things recorded in the Scriptures; but they are no evidence to the truth; they are to be regarded as mysteries of doctrine, the objects of faith, not of reason; and the truth of the Scripture, so far as they are held to be divine, is independent of them and exclusive of them.

'All this discussion, however, of the evidence of miracles is but a revival of the scepticism of Hume in another form: when he contends, that no testimony is sufficient to convince us of the reality of an alleged miracle; inasmuch as testimony itself rests for its authority on experience, and there is nothing which all experience so fully proves as the uniformity of the laws

of nature. The answer, however, to this argument from experience is, that the evidence of testimony, though its value may be confirmed by experience, is independent of such confirmation from experience, and sufficient in itself. Both kinds of evidence require to be accurately examined and tested as to their real worth, that we may neither be imposed on by false appearances, nor deceived by false statements. In fact, the person who draws a conclusion from experience depends entirely on the testimony of others for the knowledge of those facts which do not fall under his own immediate observation, but which may be no less necessary for the establishment of that conclusion. So that experience and testimony ought not to be considered as evidences essentially conflicting and un-reconcilable, to such an extent, that no testimony can be received in opposition to the uniform evidence of experience, however faithful that testimony may appear to be. In adverting, however, to the subject of miracles, we touch on that which is the root of the whole matter. It is the fundamental objection to the miraculous, existing in some minds addicted to scientific investigation, that has given rise to that method of Scripture interpretation which we have been considering. On the same ground on which Scripture testimony to miraculous interpositions may be rejected, all other testimonies to facts may be freely examined in their bearing on what are regarded as facts of experience—such as those recorded in authentic histories, or ascertained by scientific inquiry on any subject. And thus a license is taken for Biblical criticism in doing its work of excision and elimination on the Scripture records, and dissipating into myths such Scripture narratives as may not accord in their natural sense with the judgment of a speculative reason.*

* From a note appended to the MS. *Charge*, it appears that this paragraph was added in further explanation, and with reference to *Campbell on Miracles.*

'It will be said, perhaps, in defence of this method of Scriptural interpretation, that though it takes from the estimate of revealed truth a great deal that has been hitherto attributed to it, and restricts the prerogative of the Word of God to the narrowest territory of truth purely spiritual, such as by its nature is out of the purview and cognizance of human reason and judgment, it leaves entire the dogmatic system of our religion; it does not detract from the Scriptural evidence and authority of the doctrines; the essential verities of the faith which we profess. Until criticism (it is asserted) has done its work in retrenching everything from the Bible which is not throughout historically true, the doctrine does not strictly rest on a scientific basis, and cannot be held as established beyond the reach of cavil and objection. As an investigation of a truth of the natural world proceeds by rejection and exclusion of irrelevant phenomena from the matter of inquiry, and when this process of elimination has been pursued to the utmost, we conclude that what remains in the result is the truth sought on that subject: so, it is taught, under this theory of Scriptural interpretation, that the true doctrine of Scripture can only be obtained by carrying out the like process on the sacred text, and rejecting and excluding all that encrusts and envelopes it, and is no essential part of it,—all that is false in history or unsound in philosophy accidentally connected with it,—and accepting the residuum as the spiritual and divine truth revealed. And what, we may ask, is that residuum? Is it not the mere shadow of doctrine without the substance? Is faith under this view any longer 'the *substance* of things hoped for, the *evidence* of things unseen?' Can we have any assurance thus, that we have attained the ultimate point in the analysis,—that fresh improvements in Biblical criticism, fresh discoveries in natural science, further researches into history, may not require still more retrenchments from the sacred volume, and make us look

back on our present doctrines as the mere childhood of our faith, and demand that we should take larger, deeper views of the Divine truth, more consistent with the maturity of our age in the Gospel? What wonder is it, then, that in the hands of the leaders of this method of interpretation—the historic truths of the Gospel being turned into fable—the ideal should be substituted for the real; whatever is miraculous in the revelation should be held a physical impossibility; and that the living Person of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself should be idealized into a philosophical abstraction, a mere conception of the Divine Life in the heart of the believer, an imaginary perfection of humanity; that the truths relating to His Divine Person, His Incarnation and Birth, and Death and Resurrection and Ascension, are nothing more than the relations of God and man as existing in the domain of consciousness,—realities only, as ideas are so,—not objects in the world without us, independently of the perception and reflection of the mind of man. And what is all this but a new form of Gnostic error, substituting a phantom Christ for the actual Christ of the Gospel history, denying any real atonement made by a real sacrifice on the cross, and consequently any real resurrection of man in the body to the life eternal, as these heretics did against whom St. Paul argues in the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians. . . . Nor need we be too sensitive on the subject of scientific or historic inexactness being traced here and there in the volume of revelation by the keen eye of the Biblical critic. When MSS. of the New Testament began to be more diligently explored, with a view to a corrected text of the New Testament, alarm was excited at the first as to the integrity of our received text, on its being stated that there were so many variations in the reading—not less than 30,000, I think. But there was no real occasion for that alarm, when it appeared in the result that the great mass of these readings were utterly unimportant,

and that no matter of doctrine was affected by the variations observed in the MSS. The like, we may trust, will be the case when those difficulties, drawn forth by the speculations of modern science or the historical researches of modern criticism, are further examined and their weight ascertained. Some of them, indeed, may hereafter be found to be more ingenious than solid, when further discoveries shall have opened fresh views of the matter about which they are conversant. Let us look to the great characteristic of our holy faith—that, unlike all other assumed religions, it is not a collection of mystic writings, presenting to the view of man the scenes and events of the invisible world, in minute description, such as admits no test from experience and the course of the world, but consists in those very events which it narrates, and out of which it is evolved, and may be tracked continuously through more than 3,000 years in the successive periods of its delivery to mankind, thus occupying a large field in the history of God's Providence; and that we have just the same ground for believing its truth as we have for believing any other matter of history equally authenticated by events.'

CHAPTER XXI.

1863.

LETTER FROM PARIS—OCCUPATIONS IN LONDON—DISRELISH FOR GENERAL SOCIETY—NEW EDITION OF ARTICLES ON ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY—NOTE FROM SIR G. C. LEWIS—FACILITY IN MASTERING BOOKS—GENERAL READING—DELIGHT IN NATURAL SCENERY—SIR G. C. LEWIS—MEMORIAL TO HIM ERECTED IN HEREFORD—LORD PALMERSTON AT THE UNVEILING.

BISHOP HAMPDEN allowed himself very few holidays; a rare visit to the sea coast, or a ramble among Welsh mountains, once in the course of three or four years, was the utmost of his holiday-making. The reason certainly was not from any lack of enjoyment on his part in a change of air or the sight of unaccustomed scenery; but to him the change was not necessary as it is to many others, and while the business devolving upon him accumulated he could not shake off his anxiety about it.

In 1863 he was at Folkestone for awhile, and crossed from there to Boulogne, and continued the journey as far as Paris, accompanied by Mrs. Hampden and his daughter. The account of this little trip, which he gave to his sister, shows how pleasant it was to him. 'M——,' he writes, 'had never been there before; it was accordingly a great treat to her to visit that beautiful city. H—— and myself had been there several times. Still it was a very agreeable excursion to us to revisit it and see all the improvements the Emperor is introducing there; and the great change from English life was in itself very refreshing to our spirits and general health.' At the conclusion of this letter he mentions the severity with which the shock of earthquake (in the autumn of 1863) had been felt at Hereford, and the alarm of many on being waked

up by the rocking of their beds and not knowing what was next to happen.

He spent some weeks in London generally in the spring, and during this time, though his correspondence increased considerably, there were fewer calls on his personal attention than at Hereford, and this enabled him to give more time to matters requiring especial thought and reading. He would say, 'One must pour in sometimes: it will not do to be always pouring out.' It was during these intervals that he generally wrote his Charges, arranged questions for ordination examinations, and the like. He was not a regular attendant at the House of Lords, though he was seldom missing from his place when matters affecting the Church were under discussion.

With respect to general society, he rather avoided than sought for it, though not from any want of interest in others' pursuits or kindly feeling towards them; but it certainly did not afford to him the relief or amusement that it does to many busy men. It may be that his early studious life had given him a habit of thoughtfulness which prevented his throwing himself into the easy, changing humour of the moment, or that the general bustle discomposed and tired him. Public dinners, especially, with the usual accompaniment of trim little speeches, and slim little compliments, were utterly distasteful to him. When out walking or riding, or in his own house, among children and young people especially, he would talk and laugh with the rest, and show great capacity for being amused. In general intercourse with people, he got on well (as the phrase goes) both with those of cultivated education and with the simple and untaught; but with half-educated and pretentious people he failed entirely; for he took them on their own showing, which often put them in an awkward position, and they disliked him accordingly. When he was talking, his countenance

would light up with animation that contrasted with its usual thoughtful and somewhat anxious expression.

He always turned with keen pleasure to his literary pursuits. For some time he was engaged on a new edition of his articles in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' on the Philosophy of Aristotle, Plato, and Socrates. To these he added largely, subjecting also the original matter to general revision. This he completed, and the book was published in 1862.*

Bishop Hampden's varied, extensive, and accurate knowledge of books was acquired with ease and pleasure. He had a power of skimming through a book in an incredibly short time, and gaining such a general knowledge of its contents as would enable him to return to those parts of it which interested him, and even to recollect the positions in particular pages where such passages were to be found. He had great fondness for his books, which extended to the binding and lettering: he often had material additions made to the ordinary lettering, to enable him more easily to find a volume when required.

His interest and delight in the study of the great classical authors, whether in history, philosophy, or poetry, never lessened. In the last mentioned it was to Homer that he most constantly turned, wrapping himself up in the great poem-history with ever fresh enjoyment.

Modern English poetry subsequent to Walter Scott he perhaps underrated, from the want of more intimate acquaintance with it. Scott had been the poet and romance writer whose genius enchanted the world in the early part of his life, and had left a deep impression on his memory.

* In an unpublished letter from Sir George Cornewall Lewis to the Bishop, he makes the following remark, when referring to the life of Aristotle contained in this volume: 'I was struck with a remark in your life of Aristotle, that the logical terms were chiefly borrowed from geometry. It seems to me that this derivation is natural, and at the same time proves the early cultivation of geometry in Greece.'

He used to say that Scott had more 'Shakspeare in him' than any other writer of the age. It was the 'Antiquary' and 'Ivanhoe' which it pleased him most to hear read when during the long hours of sickness and sorrow those around him endeavoured to divert his mind from his many anxieties. Soon after the great sorrow of his life in 1865, when he was staying for a time at Sandown Bay, he took up the small volume of 'Enoch Arden,' which had then not long been published. He was so much absorbed by the verses that he scarcely moved his position in the corner of the little inn parlour until he had read it to the end. When he laid down the book he said, 'It is true poetry, and very beautiful.' He afterwards read other works of Tennyson with interest and admiration, but none pleased him so well as 'Enoch Arden.'

On one occasion he took up a volume of a well-known sensational novel from the drawing-room table, and after a while, as he put it down, said, 'Does any one read such books for amusement? It seems to me very hard reading!'

The great pleasure he took in natural scenery was often connected in his mind with some religious or moral feeling. In remarking especially on the beauty and repose of a village nestling in the cleft of a hill-side, he said, 'If one could only think that perfect innocence dwelt there!'

His studious life had necessarily been very much an indoor life, and this seemed to have made him more, rather than less, sensible of the beautiful effects and changes which pass over natural scenery. On his busiest afternoons he would steal out for a few moments on the terrace of the Palace garden to see the sun set over the picturesque old bridge, and its brilliant reflection in the river Wye.

Although he steadily avoided using any influence in

political contests, yet when the late Sir George Cornewall Lewis lost his election for the county of Hereford in consequence of the Corn Law agitation, he sincerely regretted that the county had refused the honour of being represented by so distinguished a man. And it was with unfeigned sorrow that, some years later, he learnt that the country had lost his valuable services, and the great example of his conscientious political life. In the autumn of 1863, with great satisfaction he took part with those who were then met together to witness the unveiling of the statue of Sir G. C. Lewis, by Marochetti, which had been erected by subscription in the space fronting the Shire Hall of Hereford. The interest of this occasion was heightened by the presence of Lord Palmerston, who, notwithstanding the more than ordinary fatigues of the session, had come down to Hereford in honour of the memory of his former friend and colleague.

The Bishop often spoke of the pleasure he experienced in receiving the veteran statesman at the Palace after the ceremony, and remarked especially on the innate kindliness of nature which led Lord Palmerston to undertake a long and tiring journey, and add to it the labour of speech-making, to show his sympathy with those who had raised the memorial to one who was then well described in memorable words as 'a wise and honest statesman, a profound scholar, and a kind and firm friend.'*

The excitement that prevailed in the quiet city of Hereford on this occasion was great. Many to whom Lord Palmerston's name was as familiar as the names of their own family and friends, had never seen him, and the greatest anxiety was shown to get a glimpse of him. Men of all shades of political opinion united in the desire to receive him with honour. After the ceremony he returned with the Bishop to the Palace, the streets being

* These words are inscribed on the pedestal of the statue.

densely crowded, and he himself apparently quite unconscious of the sensation his presence was causing. But he was amused, if not astonished, when a somewhat eccentric individual, in the tattered livery of a 'whipper-in,' came close to the carriage window, and wished his 'honour's health,' and hoped his 'honour' would 'win the Derby!'

CHAPTER XXII.

1863.

DIOCESAN DUTIES—SPIRIT IN WHICH UNDERTAKEN—VIEWS AS TO CHURCH AND STATE AGITATION—JUSTIFICATION OF ATTITUDE TOWARDS DISSENTERS—'COLENSO ON THE PENTATEUCH'—LETTER ADDRESSED TO CLERGY OF HIS DIOCESE—ITS USEFULNESS.

THE familiarity occasioned by the recurrence of his diocesan duties rather increased than lessened his interest in them. He entered into them with his whole spirit and with his whole understanding, and his great anxiety was to impart his own interest in the work to those with whom he was associated in it—to impress on others his own ever-present sense that the work they were doing was not the work of the day or the hour of this life only, but a day and an hour of eternity. There is a passage in one of his sermons in which this idea is enforced with great earnestness. 'Contemplate,' he says, 'this present life as a part of immortality. Youth, in being the beginning, is also an essential part, of our whole life. So is the whole present life, in being the beginning, also an essential part, of our immortal existence. And what an accession of importance does it obtain from this notion of it? Take the most protracted life of man;—take even the periods of patriarchal longevity;—and how little appears the sum of our years, when we consider each duration only as a *whole in itself*? Glance to the supposition of a duration in which a thousand years are but as a day, and wherein countless thousands remain to be involved after thousands have passed before. Into such a duration enters the life of man, when once it is begun in this world. It is the commencement of that

which shall never cease. What an ennobling view then is here before us, of this our mortal life! How awfully impressive is the consideration, of that having been called into being which shall never be annihilated! To form some conception of this, read the first chapter of Genesis, and observe, whether you are not forcibly struck with admiration, at the majesty of a narrative unfolding to you the beginning of all things. When you reflect, what an amazing scheme of infinite Providence was suspended on that first moment of creative energy; how unspeakably grand is the simple information, "IN THE BEGINNING God created the heaven and the earth!" An awe pervades the mind as we read the account, which no object of definite duration, though surveyed in all the parts of a long-continued existence, and however magnificent as a whole, is capable of exciting. Such then is the character of dignity with which our present life is invested, when, by the instruction of the Gospel, we behold in it, in like manner, the first moment of an immortal creation. Already, indeed, to those who thus regard human life, "this corruptible puts on incorruption, and this mortal puts on immortality." '*

Though no alarmist, he was pained to see questions brought forward which appeared to point towards the separation of Church and State, from whatever quarter the agitation came. 'There are many,' he says, 'not satisfied with that abundant toleration, and absolute liberty of religious opinion, which they enjoy under the shadow of the Church's mild rule in connection with the State, but are aspiring to perfect equality with it in importance in regard to the State, and are eagerly agitating for that object. Would that our Nonconformist brethren could but justly think of and appreciate the great liberty of conscience and advantage from that ascendancy which they really enjoy.'

* *Parochial Sermons*, second edition, p. 246.

He was never indifferent to or unmindful of his allegiance to the Church, but, on the contrary, was jealous for the maintenance of her faithful teaching. 'I have not,' he says, 'presumed to give away God's truth, over which I have no liberty—no power, but one simply of custody, and stewardship, and dispensation to the household of Christ. I have certainly indulged charitable sentiments towards those who differ from us, however widely. I have not construed the Scripture so as to justify me in hating those who hold a different creed, as if they were necessarily haters of God. But I have not been liberal out of that which is not mine to give away. I have not confounded the notion of sincerity in the individual with the attainment of truth. And in conceding, accordingly, the merit of integrity of motive to those who profess to have conscientiously sought the truth and yet missed it, I have not conceded the truth itself. I have held fast, and have encouraged others to hold fast, the one faith delivered to the saints, the one truth consigned to the Scriptures. I have in no sense been the advocate of indifferentism, or lost sight of the oneness of truth.'*

In whatever form that truth was threatened, he was anxious to guard it, and keep it pure and clear in the hearts of all men, but more especially of those committed to his care.

In 1863, when so much general uneasiness was manifested at the publication of Bishop Colenso's book on the Pentateuch, he addressed a letter on the subject to the clergy of his diocese. In the first instance he had not considered the work as in itself of that importance which was attributed to it by many, as the difficulties and objections raised in it were not new, but such as had received ample refutation in the works of many dis-

* *Lecture on Thirty-Nine Articles*, p. 45.

tinguished divines. But when he found the clergy around him seriously disquieted at its appearance, he endeavoured to reassure them by drawing their attention to some points in the discussion which in the excitement of the moment they might probably overlook.

In the first place, he tells them that he wishes to impart to them his own confidence that though the work in question 'may revive, for a time, cavils and objections which have been long put to silence,' it will not effect the result which is contemplated—that of destroying the credibility of the sacred histories. 'It is not that I have any fears,' he says, 'that that degradation of the Old Testament—which the Marcionite and Manichæan sectaries of old vainly essayed, and which has proved too hard a task even for those accomplished adversaries of modern times, a Bolingbroke, a Voltaire, and a Gibbon—can be achieved now by a less skilful hand. I only wish you to be on your guard, on behalf of your respective flocks, against the possible seduction of the weak and the unstable among them; though even with respect to these, and the public in general, I am inclined to think there is so deep-rooted a conviction in the minds of the people of this country of the sacred value of the Scriptures both of the Old and the New Testaments, that the present attempt to disturb that conviction will surely fail, as all former attempts have failed. But it may work a partial mischief among the class of persons to whom it is evidently directed—I mean the many now reached by the general education of these times who were not so accessible to former attacks addressed to the few of more highly cultivated intellect and taste.' 'The difficulties,' he says, 'put in front in these publications are just those which exact no great power of mind to apprehend them. The author condescends to the weakness of his reader, by laying before him calculations on data taken from the sacred text; and by the startling results thus obtained makes it appear tha

to believe the Books of Moses and Joshua to be real histories is like believing that two and two make five. Nothing, at the same time, can be more fallacious in such a matter of inquiry. Not only may the data from which the *reductio ad absurdum* follows be incorrectly assumed—as is very possible in regard to numerals in manuscripts in an ancient language; and this mistake may especially occur in numerals denoted by letters of the Hebrew alphabet very similar in form; but the question concerned in an examination of the credit due to an alleged history is not one to be decided by the rules of arithmetic, but by the evidence of facts in the world, and the probabilities in its favour resulting from that evidence.'*

His words of counsel on this occasion were received in a worthy spirit, as many of the remarks made upon them by those to whom they were addressed bore evidence. It appears also that his testimony to the evidence on which the Bible rests its claim to inspiration was felt by many to be of greater weight as coming from one who had himself shown a fondness for investigation, and possessed also the acuteness of mind and the learning necessary to pursuing it.

The letter was addressed to the clergy of the diocese, but it is said to have reached a wider circle, and to have been found of use among the working classes, many of whom were deeply interested in such discussions.

* *Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Hereford* (April 1863), pp. 1–4.

CHAPTER XXIII.

1865–1868.

DEATH OF MRS. HAMPDEN (1865)—LETTER TO HIS SISTER, MRS. KING—IMPORTANCE ATTACHED TO CONFIRMATION—CASE OF CANDIDATES FROM ST. MARTIN'S HOME—SERIOUS ILLNESS IN 1866—ASSISTANCE RENDERED BY BISHOPS OF PETERBOROUGH AND WORCESTER—HIS LAST ORDINATION (1867)—HEREFORD MUSICAL FESTIVAL IN 1867—CONTINUED ILLNESS—CLOSING DAYS—DEATH.

In the year 1865 the utmost sorrow of Dr. Hampden's life came to him, in the loss of one who from youth to age had stood firmly by his side—cheering, watching him, praying God for him, with the whole might of devoted affection. Such a grief no voice can speak, no hand can write. It found him, as of old, doing the work he had solemnly pledged himself to do. Though under the pressure of heart-aching anxiety, he remained at his post. His own touching words, in a letter addressed to his sister, Mrs. Robert King, best express the bitterness of that separation:

Bishop Hampden to his sister (Mrs. Robert King).

107 Eaton Place: August 1, 1865.

My dear Sarah,—You will grieve, indeed, in my heavy sorrow of heart. Still, though I have hardly nerve to write to you about it, I must not let you hear it from public rumour, or any other channel first, rather than from myself. I have, I think, told you before how much my dearest Mary suffered from weakness of health. We were in hopes that she would rally from it with the change of season and place, and she did seem somewhat benefited by the change from Hereford to London. I was absent on my duties in the diocese during April. I returned in May, and thought her no worse then at any rate; insomuch, that I went away in the beginning of June

to the ordination on Trinity Sunday, and other engagements in the country following. I was expecting she might follow with the rest, but the physician thought she had better wait awhile until she could better bear the fatigue of the journey down. This being the case, I determined to come back myself, hoping to cheer her up by my presence. But I was too late. The symptoms appeared more favourable on Thursday, July 20, and there was no apprehension among all here of any change. But on Friday morning, the 2nd, when they entered her room, she was observed with her hand up: she had evidently been praying, and had fallen asleep. She was asleep in Him in whom she trusted. He had taken her away from us, to be at peace with Him in that eternal rest which He gives to those who have served him faithfully in this life, though taken from us who remain in the world—yet, we may fully believe, comforted in meeting again in the Saviour's presence the blessed spirits of those dearest ones who went before her—meet, in their early innocence, for that happiness to which they were called. I can say no more. Pity us, and pray for us. We have laid her in the grave here. I shall one day be laid by her side in the same place. For though I have to be humbly thankful for most kind and affectionate children, there rests all my comfort in this life. I can only hope and pray that I may have grace to walk my remaining heavy way through what of this world is still before me as consistently as she ever did, doing her duty to all around her with a warm-hearted zeal and tender solicitude in them which has never been surpassed.

All the children are here with me, and join in love to you and yours.

Yours affectionately,
R. D. H.

Across the half-finished sermon for the opening of a church, which he was in the act of writing when summoned by the telegraphic message, is written, 'Begun for Wigmore church-opening: never preached.' In his pocket-book, against the date, he wrote, 'Returned home —alone, alas!'

After a few weeks spent on the sea-coast—more for the

benefit of others than of himself—he returned to his duties at Hereford. Gently he bore his grief, exerting himself to the utmost in the discharge of his duties; but his head was bowed down, and his footfall had lost its firm, quick step. The light and joy of his life were gone.

The kindness and sympathy which he received at this time from the clergy of his diocese and many others comforted him greatly, and drew forth the softening tears that the sternness of his sorrow had well-nigh dried up. In answer to a letter received at this time, he says: 'With the prayers of our own hearts, and those of friends on our behalf, we shall assuredly obtain the needful strength to bear it.'

Reference has already been made in these pages to the importance which he attached to the rite of confirmation; and longer experience made him only more desirous that every opportunity of availing themselves of it should be afforded to the young, so that they should not leave their homes and go forth into the world without this special instruction and formal admission to the Holy Communion. He was anxious, moreover, that the true and solemn character of the rite should be borne in mind both by those whose duty it was to prepare and present candidates and by the candidates themselves. In one of his Charges he dwells upon this point, and notes it as 'a cheering sign, that we do now witness generally much greater seriousness of behaviour in the young who are brought to confirmation than was formerly the case.' He goes on to say:—'Let us not then relax in the strictness of our practice, but rather enforce it by allowing none to proceed to confirmation' without satisfactory evidence that 'they are fully disposed by God's grace to take up the vows of the baptised Christian, and give themselves to the service of the Lord their Saviour.' Further on, in the same Charge, he says: 'I wish it generally understood,

that, on any occasion wherever there may be persons desirous of being confirmed, on whose account a delay would be inexpedient or inconvenient, I shall have great pleasure in attending on such calls of duty, however small may be the number assembled. I have,' he continues, 'a high estimation of the important use to which this sacred rite may be applied, in forming the religious character of the young, and strengthening them for their future conflicts with the world, and rooting them in their attachment to the Church of their baptism, their best safeguard against that indifferentism, or fanaticism,—into one or the other of which extremes so many run, on whom religion has had no firm hold in their early life.'*

It may occur to some whose eyes may fall on these pages, that on the occasion of his arranging the confirmations of the year 1866 he felt himself obliged to refuse one request to hold a confirmation under exceptional circumstances; but it was not on account of the few candidates, or from any consideration as to personal trouble or inconvenience, that the refusal was made. He was requested to confirm some inmates of St. Martin's Home for Penitents in the private chapel of that institution, and it was for the reasons appearing in the following letter that he considered such a measure inexpedient. The letter was addressed to the Lady-Superintendent of the Home:—

'I am sure,' he writes, 'your recommendation with regard to those candidates for confirmation who are to be presented from the St. Martin's Home at Hereford is given from the best motives, as well as, probably, from some knowledge of the character of the individuals themselves. But I have a strong opinion that, as the offences of their former life have been great and public, so also should their present contrition for the past be great and publicly made—the confession of their guilt and shame

* *Charge delivered in* 1856, pp. 32, 33.

being as notorious as their trust for pardon and forgiveness through their Redeemer. Hitherto it has been only a private discipline of repentance which they have gone through. The evidence of its effect remains to be given for the benefit of themselves, and of their example to others.'

The work for this summer and autumn (1866), which he had planned out with great care, it was not vouchsafed to him to carry out. On (Whit-Sunday) the eve of the day of his intended journey to Hereford to prepare for the Trinity Ordination, he had a sudden and dangerous attack of illness—congestion of the brain. He had joined in the family prayer that same evening, though he had appeared tired in body and depressed in spirits during the day. This was attributed by those around him to the circumstance of Whitsuntide being the anniversary of his last sad parting with his dearest earthly companion and friend.

At the first his case seemed almost hopeless, but his natural strength of constitution was such that with skilful medical aid* he rallied in a wonderful manner, and after some months was able to take his usual place in the family circle, to resume his accustomed exercise, both walking and driving, and to superintend his correspondence. This he did most carefully, correcting when not writing the letter with his own hand, while in many cases the letters would at his desire be re-written more than once. He was so far well that he felt the soothing power of music, especially instrumental music, and was able to be present at many of the concerts given in the day-time, where the classical music of Beethoven, Mozart, and Mendelssohn, to which he listened with so much pleasure, has of late

* The Bishop did not forget to thank Dr. Quain (who attended him in his last illness) for his kind care; nor have such thanks ever been more justly due.

years been performed with such perfect skill and taste.

His great anxiety was to return to his duties at Hereford. Several times he made the attempt, but he always suffered from it—partly from the dampness of the situation, and partly from the nervous anxiety as to the discharge of his duties which was natural to his disposition, and which his physical weakness naturally increased.

The Trinity Ordination of 1866 was the first occasion on which he had asked for assistance in any of the duties of his office during the many years of his episcopate. This ordination and a tour of confirmations were undertaken by the Bishop of Peterborough (Dr. Jeune), who, with ready kindness and disregard of personal convenience and fatigue, carried out in all its fulness the plan formed by the Bishop of Hereford, as all will readily believe who knew Dr. Jeune's great vigour of mind and earnestness of purpose. On other occasions he was assisted by the Bishop of Worcester.*

On one last occasion he was enabled to officiate—at the ordination of 1867, which was held in the private chapel of the Palace.

As the Hereford Musical Festival was to be held in the autumn of 1867, he was anxious to be present, that he might receive the guests who come to Hereford on this occasion from all parts of the diocese. He was desirous that invitations to the Palace should be sent to as many as possible, recalling names and places, and considering the various parts of the diocese from which newly-opened railways would bring people easily to Hereford. He had

* Both the Bishop and his family felt that no words could adequately express their sense of the generous kindness with which the Bishop of Worcester assisted on these occasions, leaving behind him, wherever he went in the diocese, the remembrance of duty heartily and ably performed.

always felt an interest in these meetings, and remarked especially on the increasing reverence and becoming behaviour which he had observed in the large audiences assembled in the cathedral, and on the deep impression so evidently made on their feelings by the grand devotional character of the music and the words, which scarcely seem to sound aright but within such sacred precincts. The regular services of the cathedral were not interrupted on the occasion, but, on the contrary, were more fully celebrated, and to larger congregations. When the time came he was not well enough to risk the fatigue of such an occasion, and his sons received his guests in his name. And so, though from time to time he seemed in so fair a way towards recovery, his strength never fully rallied, while the slighter ailments which in general health pass almost unnoticed, took a stronger hold upon one already weakened. It was on April 23, 1868, that he calmly breathed his last after only a few days of increased illness.

He had been able, with few intervals, to read the family prayers to the assembled household; but when he was too ill to leave his room or his bed he would ask to have them read in his room—often in the words, 'Say with me what gives me peace,' and at the conclusion would himself give the blessing, afterwards murmuring to himself 'Yes, through Jesus Christ!' again and again. He would inquire if the rest of the household had been to prayers, adding, 'Come back and tell me when you go to prayers.'

He would ask to have hymns repeated to him at his bedside after prayers, more especially the Evening Hymn and the one beginning 'Rock of Ages.' This last had always been a favourite with him, and had frequently been sung in Ewelme church. In the sad, long hours of sickness the instinctive religious character of his mind manifested itself even in his endeavour to occupy it. On

a scrap of paper, and writing on his knee, he made the following rough translation into Greek of Toplady's hymn; and although in their present form the lines would probably have been torn across rather than put into print by the Bishop himself, still it is thought that this piece of unfinished work will have none the less interest for those who knew him, and it is given here just as he left it: *

Ὦ Πέτρα τῶν Αἰώνων, ἥπερ ἐμοῦ χάριν
ἐσχίσθης, εἴθ' ἐντὸς Σοῦ κρυπτὸς ἂν εἴην,
καὶ δῶρα, τὸ μὲν ὕδωρ, τὸ δ' αἷμα, τῆς Σῆς
ἐκ πλευρᾶς τετρωμένης ῥέοντα,
διπλῆ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἴασις εἶεν,
ἀναίτιον δ' ἐμὲ καὶ καθαρὸν ποιοῦντα.

Οὐ γὰρ εἰ γε τελέσωμ' ἅπάντα
τῷ Σῷ νόμῳ τεταγμένα,
οὐδ' εἰ ζῆλός μοῦ μὴ ποτ' ἀποψυχῇ,
εἴ τ' ἐμὰ δάκρυ' εἰσαεὶ ρεῃ,
ἅπαν ἀνθ' ἁμαρτίας ἀχρεῖον,
ἐν Σοὶ σωθῆναι δεῖ, καὶ ἐν Σοί' μόνῳ.

---

* It was probably suggested to him by reading a translation of the same hymn into Latin, contained in a volume of *Translations* by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone and Lord Lyttelton, as the paper on which the lines were written was placed by him between the leaves of that book. The following is the version of the hymn (as given in the *Translations*) which the Bishop had before him at the time:—

Rock of Ages, rent for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee;
Let the water and the blood,
From Thy riven side which flowed,
Be of sin the double cure:
Cleanse me from its guilt and power.

Not the labours of my hands
Can fulfil Thy law's demands;
Could my zeal no respite know,
Could my tears for ever flow,
All for sin could not atone;
Thou must save, and Thou alone.

Οὐδὲν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν φέρω,
τῷ Σῷ σταυρῷ κολλῶμαι ἁπλῶς·
γυμνὸς, Σέθεν ἐσθῆτα ζητῶ μοὶ,
ἀσθενὴς, χάριν Σέθεν προσαιτῶ,
ἀκάθαρτος, εἰς τὴν Πηγὴν φεύγω,
λοῦσον ἐμὲ, Σωτὲρ, ἄλλως δ' ἀπολοῦμαι.

Ἕως μὲν πνεῦμα τόδ' ἔνεστί μοι,
ὁπόταν δ' αὖ τοὺς ὀφθάλμους θάνατος λύσῃ,
ἐγερθεὶς δ' αὖθις εἰς τὰ νῦν ἀγνῶτα,
Σὲ τὸν Κριτὴν ἐν Σῷ θρόνῳ ἴδω,
ὦ Πέτρα τῶν Αἰώνων, ἥπερ ἐμοῦ χάριν
ἐσχίσθης, εἴθ' ἐν Σοὶ κρύπτοιμ' ἂν ἐμέ.

The lovingness of his nature could not but strike those around him during his illness—how he clung even to the sight of those he loved and felt he was leaving; how he recognised the touch of the hand and the anxious glance of the eye, which affected him as his own suffering could not, and which seemed almost more than he could bear as he entreated, 'Only do not you look sorry!'

His expression of religious feeling partook of the natural reserve of his character: still it never was wanting, and was always simple and true, always free from mannerism or trick of expression.

He had expressed a wish to be laid in the cemetery near Hereford—one which he himself had consecrated,

---

Nothing in my hand I bring;
Simply to Thy cross I cling;
Naked, come to Thee for dress,
Helpless, look to Thee for grace,
Foul, I to the Fountain fly;
Wash me, Saviour, or I die.

While I draw this fleeting breath;
When my eye-strings break in death;
When I soar to worlds unknown,
See Thee on Thy judgment throne:
Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee.

and a spot which commands a beautiful view of the surrounding country. But remembering that Mrs. Hampden had frequently expressed a wish to be buried where she died, he wished to be laid by her side in the cemetery at Kensal Green. Of these two—united in death in that quiet grave—there is the ever-blessed hope that 'though in the eyes of the unwise they seem to die and their departure is taken for misery, yet they are at rest.'

CHAPTER XXIV.

GENERAL RECOLLECTIONS.

PERHAPS the most distinguishing quality of the Bishop's mind was its *largeness*—the power he possessed of readily and clearly understanding a posture of mind differing from, or even opposed to, his own. It was this power (by no means a common one) that gave gentleness to his judgment of others, and not the impression made on his own opinion by that of another; for he was as little disposed as a man could be to influence from without. His natural disposition was resolute to a degree that might be called obstinate.

Instances have occurred when the patience with which he would listen to objections and enter into explanations has been misconstrued, and the impression has been given that his own opinion on the particular case brought before him was not so decided as in reality it was.

Though not over anxious as to results, he was eager and persistent in any work he took in hand, whether it concerned the planting of a tree or the working out of a problem.

His taste was refined; his ear and eye were quick: he could not but see foibles, faults of taste, the vulgar, the ridiculous, the common-place. But he was never known to 'show any one up,' though at times those who knew him well saw the effort he made to command the expression of his countenance.* It greatly annoyed him to hear

* On one occasion a 'false quantity' was pompously introduced in a speech. The Bishop's expression of face showed his amusement, in spite of

people speak in a slighting, disparaging tone of their neighbours; and upon one occasion, on hearing a flippant expression of contempt used, he said quietly in reproof, 'It requires better eyes to see beauties than defects.'

Of all vices, it was hypocrisy which especially drew from him expressions of disgust. In the case of the murderer Rush, of whom it was related that he joined in the family prayers at the very time he must have been planning the horrible crime of which he was convicted, this double-hearted wickedness seemed to fill him with abhorrence, and he exclaimed, 'It is dreadful to think of such hypocrisy!'

Though calm in bearing and demeanour, he was courageous and hopeful in disposition. No one ever heard him raise his voice in anger; but at times, when he felt the matter under consideration to be of more than ordinary importance, there was decision in the very tone of his voice, although it would be lower—rather than louder—than usual.

His judgment of human nature in general was unusually and even singularly favourable, especially considering his varied experience. The reason probably was, that his sympathies were so strongly excited by everything good and great. Things of opposite qualities he had less disposition to observe. He loved to mark such qualities as manly temper, unselfishness, perseverance.*

his effort to conceal it. On being questioned afterwards at home on the subject, he said that what made it ridiculous was, *The fellow seemed so proud of it!*'

* A Cambridge undergraduate was once giving an account of an interview with his tutor concerning some breach of College discipline, which the tutor felt the necessity of visiting with some severity. Every argument and explanation, it appears, having been exhausted in vain, the interview closed and the door was shut. But the first flight of stairs descended, 'I'll try once more,' the offender thought; and he remounted the stairs and re-opened the interview. The Bishop had been an amused listener to this account, which was given with all the details and with much natural humour, and, dismissing all consideration for the tutor's time and patience, he said,—'That's the right spirit, after all.'

He insisted strongly on the necessity of a persevering and earnest spirit in all study, maintaining that in a large majority of instances it is moral rather than intellectual force that is wanting—a resolute will in the search after truth. This point is referred to in the accurate and delicately drawn sketch by Archdeacon Clark,* whose long personal acquaintance with the Bishop, and sympathy with his character, enable him to form a just opinion upon the finer as well as the more general characteristics which he displayed.

It pained him deeply to have to say a harsh thing; and in every such case he would endeavour to put the matter before the individual with whom he was dealing in such a light as to enable him to form for himself a true judgment, and to see the necessity for the course that was taken.

On first acquaintance with the Bishop, some persons have said that they felt afraid of him. He had been so singled out from the crowd, that many had in consequence formed their own idea of him without any personal knowledge of the man, and probably his reserve of manner was by some accounted as pride. But this feeling (where it really existed) soon wore off on better acquaintance, and the clergy of the diocese—and indeed most of those with whom he came in contact—remember his kindness and consideration, even before the intellectual superiority and scholarly reputation of which they might once have felt some awe.

He was emphatically a *learner* all the days of his life. It was, in his view, the want of the true spirit of inquiry that often gave rise to doubts and difficulties in the minds of men. In his 'Essay on the Philosophical Evidence of Christianity,' he speaks of this; and as the whole passage is illustrative of the mind and temper of the

* See Appendix A., *post*.

writer, an extract may perhaps be appropriately given here:—

'It is not sufficiently attended to, in general, that our conviction of the truth of our religion is an improvable talent—improvable, not by the simple accumulation of evidence only, but by the exercise and strengthening of those principles of our nature, by which the evidence is appreciated. From that corruption, which has spread its canker to the very vitals of our reason, we are, naturally, slow to believe, and incompetent to judge fairly of the pretensions of a Divine revelation. But this slowness and incompetence may be overcome by effort on our part; and the task of thus preparing the way of the Lord, is no inconsiderable part of our religious trial. It may not be in our power, at any particular period, to estimate the full force of the evidence with which religion proposes itself to our belief; but it is always in our power to cultivate, or neglect, those habits of the mind which tend to form the right disposition for religious inquiry. And the degree of satisfaction, which we may attain in the inquiry, will depend on the pains that we have bestowed, and are continuing to bestow, in disciplining ourselves beforehand—in clearing away the prejudices of the understanding, and purifying the heart. . . . The perception of the evidence demands no constitutional fervour,—no extraordinary power of mental abstraction,—no solemn sequestration of the thoughts and affections from the business of social life,—no experience in the ecstacies of fanatical empiricism. It presupposes only a candid temper of mind—"intellectum abrasum et æquum"—that simplicity which our Saviour enjoins where He says, "If thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light"—which He illustrates to us by the example of children, and commends in the person of the guileless Nathaniel,—and which is mentioned as a characteristic of the first Christian converts under that expression of "singleness of

heart." They who apply themselves with such a disposition to a contemplation of the ways of Providence, have brought their minds to that state, in which they correspond, at once, with the order of external nature, and the invisible economy of grace; and readily interpret, therefore, what they see without them, or hear of God, by what they are in themselves. In such persons, the word of the Lord, whether written "in the volume of the Book," or indicated by signs in the visible world, will have free course, and be glorified. . . . Thus going on from strength to strength, in co-operating with that Spirit, which is the efficient cause of all that is good, and wise, and powerful in man, through His gracious influence, the believer may aspire to that height in the sublime philosophy of Christianity, which is a demonstration of its truth, more Divine than that resulting from mere argumentative discussions; where "perfect love casteth out fear;" where the disciple becomes the saint; and the docility of the child of grace is consummated in the mature experience, and the wisdom, of the man of God.'*

From those who, prompted by kindly remembrance of the subject of the book, or by any other motive, may glance at these pages, the Editor requests an indulgent consideration. Slight as these 'Memorials' are, they have not been brought together without great anxiety—the anxiety of one who acutely feels the want of due experience in touching, however lightly, upon subjects with which only the wise and the learned are conversant. Still, the desire to put forth some record of Bishop Hampden's instructive and remarkable life has prevailed over every other consideration; for though it may be impossible for the best endeavour to give the needful skill for the proper execution of so difficult a task, it

* *Essay on the Philosophical Evidence of Christianity*, pp. 309-14.

may so happen that the materials which have been brought together in this volume may be sufficient in themselves to set forth the lessons to be learnt from the Bishop's life, and that the truth may thus shine out, in spite of literary faults and shortcomings.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS OF BISHOP HAMPDEN, BY THE VENERABLE ARCHDEACON CLARK, FORMERLY ONE OF HIS CHAPLAINS.

My acquaintance with the late Bishop of Hereford dates from the year 1829. He had then returned after several years' absence, and was residing at Oxford with his family. I was one of his first pupils, and I soon learned to esteem him very highly both as a tutor and a friend. From that time to the day of his death I had constant opportunities of intercourse with him. In spite of the difference of age and standing, a difference which then put a greater distance than it does now between the senior and junior members of the University, I was soon made to feel at home in all my relations with him. His manner was simple, reserved, and, perhaps, shy with strangers, but with those with whom he was familiar, he was always a cheerful and pleasant companion; free in conversation, fond of a joke, provided it was perfectly free from anything coarse or profane, not indifferent to a good pun, and ready to return one good anecdote for another, his stories always being told with a few pointed words, and with a thorough appreciation of the fun and humour of what he related. As a tutor his manner was always grave and quiet. In our daily lecture nothing was allowed to interfere with what we were engaged in. A few pleasant words might be allowed at the beginning and end of the lecture, but there must be no interruption of the work while it was being done. After the lapse of forty years, I can still see the study with its well-selected library, the table covered with several large folios, and with other evidences of

severe private study; and I can fancy that I see the figure of my friend and tutor sitting opposite to me, with his smooth, open brow, his clear dark eye, his quiet, thoughtful, and almost anxious face, while we read together his favourite authors. While we were so engaged, he threw himself wholly into the work that we were doing. He appeared to have all these authors at his fingers' ends. It seemed to me that every page of each book that we read in turn was as familiar to him as when he had just read and prepared it for his own examination many years before. The thoroughness and minute accuracy of his knowledge was marvellous to me. He appeared to have forgotten nothing; and, if we met with any detail or unusual expression, or idiom which he wished to illustrate, he would in a moment turn to the chapter and page where he could find his illustration. His memory seemed to retain all that it had once acquired; every reflection that had been thrown upon its surface seemed to be instantaneously photographed and fixed there. I once spoke to him, in a despairing tone, of the difficulty I found in remembering dates, and retaining correctly the details of ancient history. He listened to me almost impatiently, and, for the first and last time, rebuked me. His rebuke was a friendly smiting after all, administered gently, but earnestly; and it made a very deep impression on me. He begged me, if I had any respect for myself, not to repeat such a complaint; he assured me that he always understood it to mean rather a confession of indolence than of incapacity; and that the power of remembering such details as dry historical facts and dates was not simply a natural gift, but that it was to be acquired by attention, and careful analysis and arrangement of what was read. I had no doubt that he spoke from his own experience, and in those few words I had revealed to me the history of his own studious life from boyhood, how severely he had trained and disciplined his mind, and how conscientiously he had made a business of his school and college work, improving his great natural powers of mind and memory by industry and unremitting practice.

After I left Oxford in 1833, I saw less of Dr. Hampden for several years. I visited him at Oxford from time to time, and I always found him the same kind friend and pleasant companion. It was a stormy period that followed, a time of great

trial to one who was peculiarly sensitive, especially when an act or a word of unkindness was done or spoken by one who had been his friend. I can myself bear witness to the exquisite pain he suffered from this cause, especially from the alienation of former friends. His real friendships and attachments were few, but they were strong; and to him the loss of a friend, and of a friend's esteem, was the infliction of a very deep wound. Both at and after his appointment to the Chair of Divinity at Oxford, and when he was nominated to the see of Hereford, I saw him frequently, and as frequently spoke to him about what was being done at Oxford and at Hereford. He always entered freely on the subject, and expressed his thoughts and feelings to me without reserve; but I cannot recall an occasion when he spoke with bitterness, or, in the freedom of private conversation, returned railing for railing. With respect to his former friends who took part against him, his tone was kindly while it was sad; he spoke of them with sorrow, not in anger; with pity, and even with affection.

On his appointment to the see of Hereford, in 1848, I became his chaplain; and from that time until his death my relations with him were different and much closer, and I was associated with him in some of his most important duties.

I was staying with him at the house of our common friend, Mr. Senior, directly after his nomination to the see, during the interval that preceded his consecration. During the whole of that long and trying interval, his consecration being delayed by the illness and death of Archbishop Howley, he was constantly vexed by the incessant attacks of his opponents at Oxford and at Hereford, but to judge from his manner and conversation, no one of his family and friends was so little moved and irritated as he was. It was only now and then that a pained and anxious look, and a few rapid words, betrayed how deeply his feelings were stirred.

I was present with him at Bow Church when his confirmation as bishop was opposed by the Dean of Hereford. The ceremony took place on a week day, at a busy hour, when Cheapside is usually most densely crowded. On this occasion, as we approached the church, the stream of human beings usually in motion was arrested, Cheapside was in a state of congestion, and it was with difficulty that the bishop's carriage

reached the church. It was evident that all other business was suspended, and that the one object of interest to the excited crowd was the new bishop. There could be no doubt that the popular feeling was on his side. Again and again, as he passed to and from the church, he was loudly cheered, not a single sound of dissent or disapproval being heard. On entering the church, the scene was still more striking and memorable. The whole area of the church and the galleries were crowded, spectators were standing on the seats and backs of pews, and wherever there was a chance of seeing and hearing the proceedings over the heads of those who stood nearest to the spot where the ceremony was to take place. The scene and the proceedings seemed painfully out of place and keeping with the sacred building. The court, with its judges and counsel, was held at a table placed in the centre of the nave at a short distance from the communion rails. The counsel for the opposing party began his argument, urging the informality of the election, and stating in no very courteous terms the grounds of the objection to the consecration of Dr. Hampden as Bishop of Hereford. There were the usual passages of arms between the counsel for the two sides, the usual sharp remarks and replies, and once or twice a very unbecoming laugh was heard near the table, which grated painfully on the ears of those who could not forget that it was a church, and not a law court, where they were assembled. The proceedings were soon over, for the judges, after hearing the arguments of those who opposed Dr. Hampden's confirmation, declined to hear the other side, and at once proceeded to read the sentence of confirmation. Throughout the whole of these proceedings, while he was listening to the strong statements, or rather misstatements, by the counsel of his theological opinions, and was obliged to hear some hard words applied to him about heresy and infidelity, his face betrayed no anger, or even strong emotion. When at length the ceremony was over, and we succeeded in forcing our way through the vestry and the crowded porch into the street, the enthusiasm of the people could not be restrained. It was really a service of danger for those who accompanied the bishop. Everybody pressed forward to see and congratulate him; and if we had not turned ourselves into his body-guard, and almost covered him as he

passed through the crowd, he was in some danger of being crushed by his admirers. When we were seated in the carriage, Cheapside rang again with repeated cheers, which followed us until we were fairly out of sight. Some of the crowd pursued the carriage for some distance through St. Paul's Churchyard, to see and congratulate the persecuted bishop.

The popular verdict in Dr. Hampden's favour was amply justified by his after life and teaching. No one through life less courted and less deserved the observation and attacks of which he was the object. In no instance was a remark of Bishop Hinds, which occurred in his sermon preached at Lambeth, at Dr. Hampden's consecration, better exemplified, that 'the occasion of strife is not necessarily the cause of it.'

Soon after Bishop Hampden's consecration, I began my duties as one of his examining chaplains, and continued in that relation for twenty years, until his death. In the autumn of the same year, at his request, I accompanied him on his first confirmation tour throughout Herefordshire and South Shropshire. It was his first introduction to his new duties, and to the clergy and laity of his diocese. The tour occupied a whole month: we travelled in the bishop's carriage, not many miles in a day, from village to village, seldom sleeping two nights in the same place. The bishop held confirmations every day, generally twice in a day in different churches, and once or twice even on Sunday. If the Sundays were not so occupied, the bishop was otherwise engaged to preach for various public objects. The Sunday was no day of rest for him. The month was a period of incessant work, and there must have been no little strain on the bishop's powers of mind and body. It was a new world to him, his duties were new, everybody whom he met was strange to him; a student's life, it might have been thought, had not prepared him for the duties of an office which required great bodily exertion and activity; and some might have prophesied that he would have found it irksome to meet the demands of a diocese, and to be brought into daily contact with strangers.

How he met these demands, and rose to the exigencies of his new position, I can bear witness. The work, new and fatiguing as it was, did not seem to be a labour to him. The mere physical exertion of confirming, on an average, two

hundred young people daily, and of delivering (as he was wont), generally twice in the day, both an extempore and a written address to the candidates, must have been no little trial of strength. But day after day the work was done with unflagging interest and untiring vigour; and in the intervals between morning and evening service there were daily the same incessant business calls to attend to, the same offers of hospitality to accept, new acquaintances to make, and new questions to decide. On these occasions the bishop was always ready for what he had to do, giving his best attention to the subjects brought before him, and always taking his full share in the conversation at the large social gatherings that welcomed him at every new stopping-place.

Of course I often heard from our hosts and others what they thought of their new bishop. Generally there was as much surprise as pleasure expressed to find that fame had so entirely misrepresented him. Many confessed to me that their prepossessions had all been against the bishop, that they had been misled by what they had read in newspaper articles and pamphlets; that they had been taught by common report to expect in the Oxford Professor whom Lord Melbourne was forcing on them, a man who deserved at least some of the obloquy and opposition of which he had been the occasion. But they acknowledged to me that they looked in vain for the man whom their imaginations had created. They could not recognise the Oxford heretic in the modest and retiring bishop whom they saw. They could not detect the false philosophy of which he was accused in the earnest addresses and sermons they heard, which were as scriptural as they were faithful reflections of the teaching of the reformed Church of England. They found him, to their astonishment, as loyal a churchman as he was a single-minded Christian pastor. Not a few expressed themselves as feeling sorrow and shame that they had allowed themselves so entirely to misjudge him, and heartily thanked God that it had pleased Him to give them such a bishop.

This confirmation tour was not only a good breaking in for the new bishop, and a good opportunity of becoming acquainted with his diocese; it was just the occasion that was wanted for disarming opposition and dispelling prejudices;

and, in this respect, it was a triumph of truth over falsehood—an easy victory from first to last.

The ordination week, as it recurred, was always a season of some labour and anxiety, and of much interest. The bishop, as long as his health permitted, never left the work and responsibility of the examination to his chaplains. He thought it a very important part of his duty to satisfy himself, by personal inquiry and examination, that the candidates whom he ordained were 'apt and meet, as well for their learning as for their godly conversation, to exercise their ministry duly.' It was his practice, on each occasion, to contribute generally one or more of the examination papers; and for many years he took a principal part in the *vivâ voce*, always reading up the candidates' written answers, with the examiners' report of each candidate's papers, and adapting his examination to the merits or defects of each. He attached great importance to an accurate study and knowledge of the Greek Testament, and would himself take his turn in this part of the examination, testing each candidate's scholarship and industry; and, if he could detect evidence of carelessness or inaccuracy, always earnestly recommending a daily study of a portion of the Gospels and Epistles in Greek. It was no little trouble and grief to him that Latin scholarship was at so low an ebb as a qualification for Holy Orders; and that so few reached his standard in Latin composition. He also wished to promote the study of Hebrew, and for some years he continued to include this among the other subjects of examination. It caused him no little regret to find that so few of the candidates had even the most elementary knowledge of a language which was the original of the larger portion of the Bible, and a key to the understanding of the rest.

Many of the candidates who have been ordained at Hereford during the twenty years of Bishop Hampden's incumbency will remember his kind and encouraging tone and manner when he questioned them in the passage of the New Testament which they had read; and the considerate way in which he gave them every opportunity of explaining themselves, and correcting or supplying the mistakes or defects of their written answers. He used to say that a nervous candidate, who was anxious and hurried, would not do himself justice in his

written examination, but would often recover himself if he were helped and encouraged in his *vivâ voce*. He would always, if he could, give a doubtful candidate 'another chance;' and in several instances he succeeded thus in discovering veins of knowledge in a candidate which we had not detected in the written examination.

Of course there were occasions when it was the examiners' duty to reject a candidate. These, as long as they were doubtful cases, were always carefully considered and discussed in the evenings, when the day's work was done. During these discussions I have always observed the bishop's great anxiety to do full justice to the candidate, as well as to do his duty, however painful it might be to him, to the Church and to the diocese of which he was chief pastor. He would carefully weigh the candidate's words, and would make every legitimate allowance for hurry and excitement. He would seek to distinguish between want of natural ability and want of diligence and care; and was always inclined to take the side of mercy, if he could, in deciding. If he observed proof of negligence and careless ignorance, he would always act with decision and firmness, and, after patiently pointing out to the candidate what he thought wrong or defective in his examination, he would mitigate the pain he knew he was inflicting by the kind way in which he advised and directed the candidate in his studies and preparation for the next ordination.

I believe that the Hereford examinations were generally considered difficult, and the standard there a high one. It was the bishop's desire not to let the standard fall in order to meet the demand for more candidates for ordination. He would never consent to ordain a candidate who had not some scholarship as a qualification. In the case of candidates who were not of either University, he generally required a preliminary examination in some Latin or Greek author. He used often to quote with approval the canon which forbids a bishop to ordain any one 'except he be able to yield an account of his faith in Latin,' and was wont to say that it would be an evil day for the Church of England when it ceased to have a learned clergy for its ministry.

In our earlier examinations, the questions, though arranged under different heads, as historical, doctrinal, liturgical, &c.,

were not what are technically called 'book questions.' The candidates were supplied with a list of books which they were recommended to read; but they were at liberty to prepare themselves for examination in the various subjects by reading any books they liked. The questions set were such as might be answered by those who had only a general knowledge of the subject, and were not intended to test the candidate's accurate knowledge of any particular author. Experience taught us that this was not the best course to follow; and after a few trials, at the bishop's suggestion, we adopted a new method, to which we afterwards adhered. A list of books, with variations from time to time, was printed at the beginning of each year. This list always included a work on the 'Articles,' either Burnet or Browne, generally Pearson on the 'Creed,' or Hooker's 'Fifth Book,' sometimes Butler's 'Analogy,' and one or other of such works as Davison on 'Prophecy,' Marsh on the 'Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible,' Marsh's 'Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome,' Graves on the 'Pentateuch,' Robertson's 'Church History,' Blunt on the 'Study of the Early Fathers,' his 'Scriptural Coincidences' and 'Parish Priest,' and always a portion of one or other of the Greek or Latin Fathers, Clement, Chrysostom, Justin Martyr, &c. The Scripture paper was made of chief importance, and for this the candidates were required to be prepared with an accurate knowledge of the historical books of the Old Testament, and to have read carefully and critically the Greek of the New Testament. It was understood that the examination would be in the books named in the list, which the candidates were expected to read with that view. After some years' experience, we had every reason to be satisfied with the results of our new system. The answers to the questions were much less vague than they had previously been; evidently the candidates knew something of their subjects; they had had in their studies a definite object before them, and were able to concentrate their attention on one point, instead of being tempted to wander over a large field. The result was what we had expected. The answers of the candidates were more accurate, and the examiners had much less difficulty in deciding on their merits; and, what was of even more importance, this method of examination had obliged

the candidates to acquire a much truer knowledge of their subjects by being saved from the old desultory habits of reading which the former system had encouraged, and thus a good foundation was, we hoped, often laid for the student to build upon in after life.

On a review of the whole period of twenty years during which I was associated with the bishop in these duties, the impression which he has left upon my mind is of one who took more than common interest and part in the actual work of the examination, and who made it a matter of conscience to sift carefully all the evidence he could obtain of the fitness, moral and intellectual, of those whom he was called upon to ordain. Certainly, the examinations were not a form only, but a very real and anxious inquiry into all that could be learned of the several candidates. I recall many times when I was surprised at the bishop's minute acquaintance with the circumstances and details of the candidates personally, and of the small and distant village cures which they were going to serve.

These discussions as to the merits of the candidates, and the circumstances of their several cures, very often led on to other questions and discussions of more general interest. On these occasions I was often surprised at the detailed knowledge which the bishop had acquired of the different parishes and clergymen of his diocese. He appeared to know what was going on everywhere, what each one was doing or not doing; and he would often go on, discussing subject after subject, clergyman after clergyman, with unflagging interest until a late hour at night, showing how well he kept himself informed, and how much he made it his duty to keep the oversight of the diocese committed to his charge.

Another characteristic of the bishop was the kind and conciliatory manner of his intercourse with the clergy, and all with whom he had business relations. Those who have been brought into personal contact with him will remember, with respect and affection, how evidently it was his instinct, in discharging the duties of his holy office, to be as kind as he was just in his judgments, as gentle as he was firm in his administration of his diocese; and how naturally his wishes and

directions, when they were sought, were spoken more as counsels and suggestions than as commands; in the tone of a friend or a father rather than of one who bore rule.

Another point ought to be noticed, in duty to his memory. The prominence given to the late bishop in the early period of the Tractarian movement has led many who did not know him to believe that he was a churchman of a very Low or very Broad type—one who, in his Church principles, stood in direct antagonism to those who were the leaders of that movement. There never was a greater mistake. Dr. Hampden was by constitution, and by conviction, a strong, if not a High, Churchman. I speak this advisedly, and after long acquaintance with his opinions and leanings on most points of theological and Church interest. His opponents would not recognise this, although his sermons and lectures, while he occupied the Chair of Divinity at Oxford, ought to have convinced them of it. Strangers at Oxford, who had known Dr. Hampden only by reputation, and had formed their opinion of him from what his opponents said, have been known to express their astonishment at finding, from his sermon or lecture that they had just heard, how entirely their prepossessions had deceived them as to the true character of his mind and opinions. 'Why, I thought to hear a heretic preach, but I have heard the sermon of a learned and orthodox High Churchman,' was once the language of one who was well able to form a correct and unbiassed judgment. And this was my conviction after twenty years' intimacy with the late bishop. He was as loyal and sound a member of the Church of England as any of her sons; as orthodox in his views and teaching on the doctrines of the faith as it is held by our Reformed Church, and expressed in her articles and formularies, as any who belong to the ranks of her ministering clergy; as clear and as sound in his views and teaching on the subject of the Church's two Sacraments, nay, much more so than many who thought it their duty to attack him.

But let all this be forgotten! He is beyond the reach of controversy and misrepresentation, where opinions, and principles, and motives, as well as actions, are known, and weighed, and rightly estimated. The friends of the Church of England

have too much to think about, too many dangers to encounter soon, to make it wise or safe to revive an old controversy, or even to remember a strife which once stirred her to her foundations, and made her enemies rejoice in expectation of her downfall.

GEORGE CLARK.

APPENDIX B.

I. DR. HAMPDEN'S LETTER TO THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON ON THE PROCEEDINGS OF 1836—II. THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON'S REPLY—III. LETTER FROM DR. HAMPDEN TO LORD JOHN RUSSELL (1847)—IV. LETTER FROM LORD JOHN RUSSELL TO THE DEAN OF HEREFORD (1847)—V. REPLY OF LORD JOHN RUSSELL TO AN ADDRESS FROM THE CLERGY OF THE ARCHDEACONRY OF BEDFORD—VI. THE BISHOP OF NORWICH'S (DR. STANLEY) REASONS FOR NOT JOINING IN THE PROTEST OF THE BISHOPS.

I.

Dr. Hampden to the Duke of Wellington.

St. Mary Hall: March 9, 1836.

My Lord Duke,—I beg leave most respectfully to appeal to your grace, as Chancellor of the University, on the matter of the present proceedings in Oxford. Your grace will probably have learned that there has been considerable agitation here respecting my appointment to the Regius Professorship of Divinity.

I do not object to the expression of feelings on the part of individuals, however unjustifiable I may consider them. What I wish to call your grace's attention to is, the circumstance of the University having taken upon itself the censorship of theological opinions, without any authority, as I conceive, for so doing by its statutes or by the law of the land. When I say it has taken upon itself such a censorship, I mean to state that, in compliance with the requisitions of an active party here, the University has undertaken to frame a statute in which, under cover of depriving the Regius Professor of Divinity of certain rights and powers conferred on the office by existing statutes, censure shall be passed on my theological writings.

Such a statute is now under contemplation at the Board of

Heads of Houses. As I contend that this proceeding is altogether unstatutable, as well as illegal—the University being a lay corporation, and having no power of inflicting ecclesiastical censures—I humbly request your grace's interference; and that you will institute inquiry into the legal and statutable propriety of the measure in question before it be suffered to advance further.

There is the greatest endeavour made to push the matter to a precipitate decision. It was determined to-day that another meeting of the board is to be held on Friday, for the consideration of the statute.

I have, therefore, felt it necessary to lose no time in giving this information to your grace, and earnestly soliciting your immediate attention to the subject.

I do not trouble your grace on this occasion with any defence on my part against the charge of erroneous views brought against me by certain members of the University, though I feel that I am innocent on that ground.

I have the honour to remain, my lord, your grace's faithful, humble servant,

R. D. HAMPDEN.

II.

The Duke of Wellington to Dr. Hampden.

Strathfieldsaye: March 11, 1836.

Sir,—I have had the honour of receiving, this morning, your letter of the 9th instant.

You are a member of the Board of Heads of Houses of the University of Oxford, and you cannot be ignorant that I, as Chancellor of the University, at a distance from Oxford, have no voice at that board.

I refer your letter to the Vice-Chancellor, and request him to lay it before the board with this answer.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

WELLINGTON.

III.

Letter from Dr. Hampden to Lord John Russell.

Christ Church: December 9, 1847.

My Lord,—It is indeed painful to an honest mind to have to answer a charge of unfaithfulness to a high trust. And what else is the charge alleged by certain parties, who are reviving a clamour against me, and agitating the clergy with their jealousies and alarms, but that of unfaithfulness to my engagements to the Church of which I am a minister? If a person holds not in sincerity the doctrines of the Church to whose ministry he has been called—if he is nominally and professedly in the Church, but in heart dissents from, or is indifferent about, its faith—what is this, which is the substance, as far as appears to me, of what has been advanced against me, but an imputation of the grossest dereliction of religious and moral duty?

In ordinary circumstances I might treat such an attack with silent contempt. But there are occasions which demand a sacrifice of feeling. And the present appears to be such an occasion, when, by thus publicly addressing your lordship, I shall at once discharge a duty to Her Most Gracious Majesty and to yourself, my lord, the First Minister of the Crown, and may hope, at the same time, by a simple statement of the truth, to tranquillise the minds of humble and earnest Christians who may have been perplexed by the impassioned appeals made to them against me.

It is, as I have said, a painful trial to have to encounter such most groundless, but most unrelenting, enmity. After a devoted service in the ministry of the Gospel for more than a quarter of a century, of which the last twelve years have been divided between the labours of the Divinity Chair and parochial ministrations, I might well be excused from replying to accusations which my whole life, passed under the eyes of men, and in the presence of that All-Seeing God who tries the heart, effectually refutes—from being required to deny having impugned those vital truths of our holy faith which it has been my constant study to uphold and enforce.

Alas, my Lord, how commonly in the jealousies and heart-burnings of the polemical spirit is that precept of the Divine law, 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour,' carelessly violated! The promotion of certain views, or the depression of an antagonist, is too often regarded by the corrupt human heart as a warrant for any excess of uncharitableness and even for untruth.

If ever there was a time when the circumstances of the Church presented a temptation to this offence, it is the present. The Church has now for many years been grievously troubled by what is familiarly known as the Tractarian movement—an organised agitation for the purpose of secretly revolutionising the Church of this country, for unprotestantising it, as it has been said by some of the party, or 'developing the Catholic principle latent in it.' With what effect the movement has been working is but too evident. Not only have numbers been seduced from the Church of their fathers to the corrupt Church of Rome, but among such many even of the clergy, forgetting their ordination vows, and their sacred obligation to the Church which carried them to Christ in baptism, have led the way in the apostacy. Nor has the evil been stopped by these open secessions. Many remain among us deeply infected with the same principles which have carried others openly to Rome. These consist chiefly of the younger clergy, ready, as late events have shown, to respond to the call of their leaders, and to throw the weight of their numbers into any question of high interest to their party. In such a state of things, no one's theological or pastoral character is safe. Any one who is adverse to the designs of the party, and whom it may be worth while to attack, cannot expect to escape. Nothing is easier in such times of excitement than to collect a number of signatures of persons whose names are already registered with their leaders, and to make such persons (as they are for the most part zealous and active men), eager to prove their chivalry in the cause, centres of agitation in different parts of the country.

Nor is it anything strange or novel, my lord, which is now happening. From the Scriptures we learn how the Apostles themselves, following their Lord in His persecutions, were reviled and evil-entreated by their brethren. In our own

country, the learned author of the 'Defence of the Nicene Creed,' Bishop Bull, had to complain of a charge of Socinianism brought against him by a brother minister of the Church. And before him, even the excellent Hooker had to defend his opinions delivered in sermons at the Temple against the exceptions of an opponent from the same pulpit; and at a later period of his life, amidst the simplicity and blamelessness of his daily conversation, to resist a scandalous attack on his character which nearly bowed him to the grave. And thus Archbishop Tillotson complains, in one of his sermons, of the evil tongues of his days. 'I know not,' he says, 'how it comes to pass, but so it is, that every one that offers to give a reasonable account of his faith, and to establish religion upon rational principles, is presently branded for a Socinian . . . . But if this be Socinianism for a man to inquire into the grounds and reasons of Christian religion, and to endeavour to give a satisfactory account why he believes it, I know no way, but that all considerate, inquisitive men, that are above fancy and enthusiasm, must be either Socinians or Atheists.'

Let me, then, I would say, my lord, be instructed and encouraged by these and other like examples to submit with patience to His will, who, in the mystery of His providence, has appointed for good that I, humble servant of His as I am, should pass through this ordeal of calumny. What is most afflicting in it is, that I am accused of detracting from His glory and the infinite merits of His blessed atonement. He knows, however, that I have not done so. I am solaced and strengthened with this thought. I hope, therefore, calmly to address myself to the objections which my importunate adversaries, with all the vehemence of an electioneering contest, are recklessly throwing out against me. Let me endeavour to silence that conflict of feelings within my own heart, which so unmerited and so base a charge naturally excites.

First, then, my lord, I most solemnly deny the scandalous imputation. As an honest man, I say, I do not, and never did for one moment of my life, in thought or word, hold or maintain any other doctrine respecting our Lord's most holy person and His blessed work of Redemption than that which is plainly set forth from Scripture in the Articles and formularies of our Church. I hold, too, and have ever held most firmly,

the full doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as stated on the same authority in the same documents of the Church.

Nay, I go on to say, with the utmost confidence in my sincerity, that I have on every occasion exerted myself to defend these holy truths, which I believe not with a mere assent, but really love and delight in. My conviction has been that no sermon, no exposition of religious doctrine, or exhortation to religious conduct, could have any unction of spiritual instruction, any living power to teach or to persuade, which did not derive its strength from these holy and lovely truths, which describe to us God the Father giving His only-begotten Son, His co-equal in majesty and power, 'to the end that all that believe in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life,'—God the Son giving Himself in love, taking on Him our nature, and born into the world, living and dying for us men, and for our salvation,—God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, the Third Person in the Blessed Trinity, sent down with holy comfort from the Saviour to instruct and guide the Church through all ages.

These great revealed verities—no mere opinions collected by speculative reasoning, but the manifest indisputable teaching of Scripture, without which Scripture would not be what it is—I have, then, ever taught and enforced both as most certain and as most necessary to be believed.

It is not my teaching, whatever may have been attempted to be shown by prejudiced adversaries, that the doctrines of Scripture or any other of its great fundamental truths, such as Original Sin, Justification by Faith, preventing and assisting Grace, the efficacy of the Two Sacraments instituted by our Lord, are nothing more than theories formed by the human mind on the text of Scripture. It is a very great mistake to suppose that I have ever meant this, in what I have said of the force of theory, in my 'Bampton Lectures' or elsewhere. It is one thing to endeavour to unfold the theories on which a particular phraseology employed in the systematic statement of Divine truths has been framed and adapted to its purpose, and quite another thing to state that the *truths themselves*, which that phraseology expresses, are mere theories, or mere opinions, or probable conclusions having no positive certainty

in them. This latter misconstruction belongs to those who have taken it up. It is not mine. It has no warrant in anything that I have said in theological discussion. My 'Bampton Lectures,' indeed, were not written for popular reading, but for such as should come to the study of the subject with some previous knowledge both of theological questions and of ancient philosophy. It is no wonder, then, that they should be open to misrepresentation to ordinary readers. I should be much concerned if, from any unskilfulness in the use of words, I should have given rise to misapprehension. I would not assert, however, that I have always succeeded in conveying my thoughts exactly. But I am not, at any rate, to be blamed for some mistakes, or rather perversions of my meaning. For this I know, that arguments which I have advanced in support of the truth have, in many instances, by an artful selection of detached words, been represented as upholding the very errors which they refuted.

But whatever has been done by hostile and uncandid expositors in the way of perverting or obscuring my meaning, I have the satisfaction of knowing that many honest and intelligent minds have apprehended my true intent, and appreciated my labours. Thus, for instance, this or that person would not or could not see that it is a strong argument for the truth of the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, that even heretics (as I have urged) have in some sense professed it, however imperfectly and injuriously, thus acknowledging the truth amidst their vain attempts to corrupt and destroy it, unconsciously bearing testimony to its existence in disputing it; and the truth itself showing its vital strength in surviving their attacks.

Many such instances of cruel misrepresentation I could allege. But I will not weary your lordship's patience. Let me, however, be suffered to say what I would fain have remembered only in thanksgiving to Him whose grace enables us to think or do anything good. I know that I have reason to bless God that in one instance at least I have not laboured in vain; but that a person, now a pious and distinguished minister of Christ, was confirmed and fixed by what I have advanced on the subject of the Trinitarian controversies, in the true faith of that holy mystery. And does not this one

fact more than outweigh the assertions of a thousand anonymous writers in newspapers, copying one another, and repeating the original false statement of the first mistaken or misrepresenting commentators?

Most sincerely, then, and most firmly, do I believe that there is but one Catholic faith—one invariable standard of orthodox truth; and that all departures from this, consequently, are errors of doctrine, and corruptions of the faith, and not that 'form of sound words' which God has set forth to us in His revelation.

I challenge my impugners to disprove this assertion of my belief: not by sophistical constructions, not by garbled quotations, such as the public has been too familiar with from their hands; not by mere verbal inferences, not by the false colouring of their own minds, or by the shadows cast from their own theories; but from plain and direct assertions, qualified and explained, as all assertions must be, by the context and other passages, and the general tenour of my writings. They have hitherto kept certain portions of my publications as much as possible out of view. They have continued repeating certain sentences, or half-sentences, as if these were so many oracular dicta of mine, striking ever on the same note which they once found to awaken a chord in the minds of the uninformed or the prejudiced, skilfully, indeed, as tacticians, but most dishonestly as men. Let them, then, abandon these mere party-polemics. Let them fairly show, if they can, where I have expressed the slightest doubt of the truth or of the importance of the great Christian doctrines which are the foundation of our faith. I may appeal to any of my sermons, preached or published (I include in this reference a volume of 'Parochial Sermons' published by me in 1828 and since reprinted), and to every course of lectures delivered by me, whether public or private, as Regius Professor of Divinity.

But, my lord, whilst I fully believe that there is but one Catholic faith, I am not required by this persuasion to treat disrespectfully, or uncharitably, all that differ from us, or that conscientiously declare that they, for their part, cannot learn that faith from the Bible. I would do nothing to encourage dissent from the Church. It grieves me wherever I

see it. But at the same time I am for a full toleration, if dissent be only open and avowed; a toleration, that is, extending not only to the grant of civil privileges to dissenters, but to the equitable and kind consideration of their statements and arguments, as well as of their feelings. I would try to win them over—I would not exasperate them. I would not presume to surrender God's truth, which is not mine to give away, or to call error and falsehood by the sacred name of truth. But as for candid and indulgent consideration for the persons of those who are in error, this is in every man's power, and is every Christian man's bounden duty to give. This, then, I would not withhold even from those who have departed the farthest from the true faith.

If, accordingly, on any occasion I have ventured to call Unitarians Christians, surely this must be understood in the wide charitable sense of the term—not in that strict sense in which it belongs to a believer in the Divinity and the blessed atonement of our Lord, but in a sense not unlike that in which it is used in our Liturgy, when we pray for 'all who profess and call themselves Christians,' that they 'may be led into the way of truth,' &c. What I may have said then in charity of the persons or of the modes of reasoning of misbelievers, cannot in any fairness be understood as indulgence to their tenets. I repeat, I not only regard the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, and of the Incarnation and Atonement of our Lord, and the Salvation of man through Faith only in Him, with the truths arising out of and closely connected with these great doctrines, as most certain, but further, as vitally important to be believed, in order to a saving faith, and a right practical religion. So intimate, indeed, I conceive is the connection between a sound theology and a right religious conduct, that they alone can properly be said to have a right religion who have a sound theology. Still, the two terms theology and religion admit of being separately defined, according to the proper notion of each. For so St. James speaks of 'pure religion, and undefiled before God;' pointing out the practical moral duties, the charity and purity of life, wherein it consists. Surely no one can justly suppose from this, that St. James dispenses with a sound theology, as the basis of that religion which he describes. Nor ought I to

have been construed as divorcing a sound theology and a right religion.

I have insisted, indeed, my lord, constantly on the supremacy of Scripture as our rule of faith. And what consistent member of the Church of England does not? But this very assertion of the supremacy of Scripture has been taken up invidiously by some, as if I rejected altogether the authority of the Church, and undervalued its importance as a visible institution of Christ's religion. This, however, cannot by any means be justly said of me. I have ever taught that a deferential respect to the authority of the Church, as it is laid down and explained in the formularies of our Church, was most incumbent on Christians; though certainly not that high and transcendent respect which is due to the Inspired Word alone. But the fact is that many of those who are now objecting to me will be satisfied with no view on this subject which is not virtually the same as that of Rome—ascribing to the Church, not only an authority of order, such as is claimed in our Articles, but an absolute authority for propounding matters of faith, and requiring its decisions to be received with unquestioning submission by its members. The Church, in their view, is not simply 'the witness and keeper of Holy Writ,' but the depository of revealed truth, the authoritative interpreter of Scripture, without which Scripture is conceived by them to speak an uncertain sense.

But what is this but to suppose that the Church is endued with an infallible authority? For, unless it can pronounce infallibly, how can the Christian be required to receive its decisions as Divine truths obligatory on his faith?

This notion, however, of Church authority will be found to be the root of the objections of this class of theologians to the teaching of all who require that all doctrines should be drawn from Scripture. With them, the reference to Scripture is an 'heretical principle:' because it holds up the authority of Scripture over that of the Church in all questions of doctrine. Hence their animosity against all who thus establish the articles of faith, and their unchecked boldness in repeating charges of heresy against any confession of faith, however sound in itself, which claims to be simply scriptural in its authority. A person in their view is no believer who

does not hold *their* 'Church principles'—that is, who does not build his faith on the Church in their sense.

But, my lord, I must notice, before I conclude, the hollow pretence of those who are resting their objections to me on the statute of the University, passed in 1836.

I think it will be found that some of those who are urging this point were the most active instruments themselves in carrying that illegal measure. Men are naturally unwilling to acknowledge their wrong. More is the honour due to those excellent persons who have not wished that day of excitement to be remembered against me, but would now gladly erase the record of it. But it is distressing to see that there are others who would fall back on their own wrong, and would take a false advantage from it, to justify themselves to themselves, and to the public.

That statute, however, I would observe, has been virtually repealed by two subsequent proceedings in the University; in the first place, by the New Theological Statute of 1842, which placed me, as Regius Professor, at the head of a newly constituted Board of Theological Examiners; and then, in the same year, by the just act of the chief authorities of the University, with whom rests the initiative of every measure, the Board of Heads of Houses and Proctors, who unanimously proposed a form of statute for rescinding it. So far, then, as the chief responsible body of the University is concerned, I am relieved of the burden of that statute; though the Tractarian party succeeded, with a very reduced majority, however, in throwing out the measure in Convocation.

And is not the history of that statute perfectly understood? How can any venture to put it forward now, when by such an act they are implicating themselves with the theology and the spirit of its chief promoters? Every one knows that the editors of the 'Tracts,' and others following in their wake, were the great instruments in the work of calumny on which it was founded. A pamphlet full of gross misrepresentations of my writings, the production of Mr. Newman, was circulated through the country. And the calumnies thus spread abroad concurred with the great political excitement of the times in obtaining a majority against me; not, however, even then, until after a repulse on the first assault by the firm and

spirited intervention of the Proctors. How then can any wish to sympathise or identify themselves with the chief actors of that day? Where is Mr. Newman now, let me ask, the principal mover then? What are the rest doing—his old associates whom he has left—but training others to imbibe the spirit of their great leader, reluctant as they may be to follow him throughout.

With what real truth, therefore, can it be said that, as certain persons seem to take an unenviable pleasure in repeating, I am under 'the censure of the University'? I am not, my lord, in truth. In fact, the statute referred to no opinions or doctrines whatever, but only to the *manner* of treating theological subjects. When indeed a censure of the University is passed, certain propositions are selected from the author's writings, and the decree of Convocation condemns those particular propositions. This was done recently in the case of Mr. Ward, the author of the 'Ideal of the Christian Church.' Nothing of the kind was done in my case; nothing specific was ever alleged against me.

Certainly, whatever may have been the first design of the statute referred to, it has had no effect. It has been practically a dead letter. I have continued to preach and lecture in the University, without any diminution of attendance or respect on account of it. No Divinity Professor before me, I believe, has been better attended, or received more marks of confidence from his hearers.

Then, my lord, if further witnesses are needed to my character as a Christian minister, let the thousands who have heard my sermons and my lectures speak for me. Again, let any of my parishioners, who have known my manner of life and conversation now for twelve years past, and my whole ministry among them, in the church, in the school, and from house to house, be called to give their evidence. But let not the public be deluded into a rash and false judgment by anonymous slanderers in newspapers. Nor let an undue weight be attributed to meetings convened by circulars sent through the country, under the instigation of a few individuals who are, for the most part, well-known adversaries, not only of me, but of all that is Protestant in our Church.

I trust, my lord, I have not exceeded that reserve which

becomes me in addressing your lordship. I am sure you will not wonder at my feeling strongly on an occasion of such solemn interest to me.

I have the honour to be, my lord, with every sentiment of respect, your lordship's greatly obliged and faithful servant,

R. D. HAMPDEN.

IV.

Lord John Russell to the Dean of Hereford.

Woburn Abbey, December 25, 1847.

Sir,—I have had the honour to receive your letter of the 22nd instant, in which you intimate to me your intention of violating the law.

I have the honour to be your obedient servant,

J. RUSSELL.

The Very Rev. the Dean of Hereford.

V.

Reply of Lord John Russell to an Address from the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Bedford.

Woburn Abbey, December 30, 1847.

Reverend Sirs,—I have received with great satisfaction the expression of your opinions on the elevation of Dr. Hampden to the episcopal bench.

I rejoice to learn that you 'have no share in those feelings of alarm attributed to the clergy through the activity of a portion of them,' on the subject of that appointment.

Two grounds have been taken to justify the alarm, and account for the activity of which you speak. The one is the vote of want of confidence passed by the Convocation of the University of Oxford in 1836; the other, the suspicion of unsoundness in the faith.

With respect to the first ground, the Bishops of Durham and Norwich, and many other eminent persons, have pointed out the fallacy of placing reliance on a party-vote of Convocation, passed in a period of party excitement, without due examination, and void of ecclesiastical authority. Mr. Wood-

gate has gone further; he has said, speaking of a similar vote: 'The proper appeal is not to the passions of a mixed multitude like Convocations, where, besides having no lawful jurisdiction in the case, there is no exposition of the law, no reference to precedent, no hearing of evidence, and where the same persons are at once prosecutors, judges, and jurymen.' But let us grant that the Convocation was justified in its distrust, let us concede that the University properly decreed that Dr. Hampden should be deprived of certain functions belonging to his office, 'because in his writings he had so treated theological subjects that, in this respect, the University had no confidence in him.' Have we had no experience since 1836? Is it not possible that Dr. Hampden may have used expressions, obscure or careless, which might induce the University to distrust his teaching of theology, but that the evidence of eleven years of sound teaching and blameless conduct, as Professor of Divinity, may have removed the just causes of suspicion? Such I should imagine to be the opinion of the heads of the University itself; for, in 1842, they placed Dr. Hampden in the chair of a Board of Theological Examiners. Such, I should imagine, to be the conclusion of the great majority of our bishops. For they have required from the Oxford candidates for orders certificates that they have received instruction in theology from Dr. Hampden. They were clearly under no obligation to do so. The Bishop of Exeter and a few other prelates have declined to receive Dr. Hampden's certificates, and have proceeded to ordain upon other testimony more satisfactory to them. So that, with the exception of five or six, our bishops must have freely, voluntarily, and deliberately required the proof of attendance on Dr. Hampden's instructions in Divinity as a necessary preliminary to ordination.

Can there be stronger proofs of the confidence reposed in Dr. Hampden—first, by the resident heads of the University of Oxford; and secondly, by the great majority of the bishops? How few men have been elevated to the episcopal bench with a greater weight of authority in their favour! The head of a Theological Board of Examiners—the teacher of candidates for the priesthood; can those who recognised and confided in him in these characters have believed that he held, himself,

unsound opinions in theology? He who was to examine others—he whose training of young men was to qualify them to receive the solemn rite of ordination. Surely this were to malign the University of Oxford and the great body of our prelates!

But further: I have elsewhere alluded to the fact, that some time before I recommended Dr. Hampden to the Queen, I communicated my intention to our venerable Primate, and received from him no discouragement. It is true that the Archbishop did not appear to think Dr. Hampden well qualified for the diocese of Manchester; neither, on reflection, did I think proper to recommend him to the Crown for that see, in the peculiar circumstances of its population and Dr. Hampden's studious career. But no one who has that veneration which I entertain for the candour, piety, attachment to Church and State, and friendly kindness of our Primate, will believe the calumny that he thought the appointment might not happen during his natural or my official life, and therefore concealed his opinion that it would be an act of reckless insult and injury to the Church.

I feel no doubt that the Archbishop, whatever objections he might have felt to Dr. Hampden in 1836, had become reconciled to his promotion by the orthodox and Christian character of his subsequent writings.

It was, therefore, on due consideration of the proceedings of 1836, and of subsequent years of Dr. Hampden's labours at Oxford—of the many instances in which his predecessors had been raised to the bench—of the policy of giving rewards to learning—and lastly, to the zeal for our Protestant Reformation displayed by Dr. Hampden, that I named him to the Queen as the successor of the Bishop of Hereford.

I come now to the second ground of objection. After I had taken the Queen's pleasure, and Her Majesty had graciously approved of the appointment, I received privately from the Archbishop, and publicly from thirteen of the bishops, a warning that the elevation of Dr. Hampden would be disapproved by the majority of the clergy.

Had this objection been founded on any just accusation against the life and morals of Dr. Hampden, it was not too late to confess my error and withdraw my recommendation;

but, founded as it was upon a charge of teaching unsound doctrine, it behoved me not to desert a clergyman whom the Queen had been pleased to nominate for a bishopric, without some authority or substantial proof.

No such authority appeared. The conduct of the archbishops and bishops gave a strong presumption the other way. No such proof was given; you say very justly: 'None such have we found; no proof or evidence of any strange doctrine, contrary to God's Word, as held or avowed by Dr. Hampden.'

On the other hand, a strong testimony of the baseless nature of the charges against Dr. Hampden is to be found in the 'extracts' made by his enemies from his writings: 'such extracts (as you say truly), by their garbled form in some instances, by false connections in others, quite reversing the true meaning of the passages.' The gross dishonesty of these quotations has been fully shown in an admirable letter by Archdeacon Hare. He observes very justly that, by leaving out the first words of one passage and the last words of another, we might extract from Scripture the dogma—'There is no God,' and the precept—'Go and sin.'

The learned and pious author of this letter did not originally, indeed does not now, approve of the appointment. But, I think, having proved so clearly the unfair means taken to ruin the reputation of Dr. Hampden, he must in candour allow that, if such means are to deprive a clergyman of those distinctions which our Church boasts of maintaining as the rewards of learning, a fatal blow is struck at all profound inquiry, at all enlightened pursuit of truth, at all clerical independence.

Let us not mistake our position. The Church is not in that easy security of the last century which gave birth to so much negligence, to so much abuse of wealth, to such a perilous apathy. The Church of Rome on the one side, with abundant knowledge, with an imposing authority, seduces many to her communion. The right of private judgment is by many avoided as a dangerous snare; the duty of private judgment is thrown off by many more as too heavy a burden. On the other side, the Protestant Dissenter assails the Church Establishment, as an engine for fettering the conscience and taxing the property of the subject. Novelties have their

charm; the High Churchman and the Independent speak alike, with complacency, of the separating Church and State.

I know no better security against such a danger than an able and learned episcopal bench, a zealous and God-fearing parochial clergy. Thus may the Reformation be defended, thus may the Establishment be maintained: otherwise neither Parliament nor Præmunire can beat off the assailants of our Church Constitution.

But, it is said, I have disturbed the peace of the Church. There is no use in crying peace where there is no peace. The appointment of Dr. Tillotson to the Primacy provoked a party whose relentless fury pursued him to the day of his death. They denounced him as a Socinian and an Atheist. Yet our great Deliverer never made a wiser or more judicious appointment. In our own day we have seen the learned Dr. Lloyd, once Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, pursued with bitter invective when, on the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, he gave expression to the loftiest feelings of Christian charity. You have spoken with praise of the sermons of Dr. Hampden, and your testimony in this respect is peculiarly valuable. You consider his appointment as 'a circumstance favourable to the health of the Church.' It is in that view that, unconnected with, and personally unknown to, Dr. Hampden, I have recommended him to the favour of my Sovereign. I earnestly and devoutly hope that your anticipations and mine may, by the blessing of God, be amply fulfilled.

I have the honour to be, with great respect, your most obedient servant,

J. RUSSELL.

To the Rev. A. J. Crespin, Vicar of Renholt, &c., &c.

VI.

*The Bishop of Norwich's (Dr. Stanley) Reasons for not joining in the Protest of the Bishops.**

Palace, Norwich: December 1, 1847.

My dear Lord,—On maturely considering the memorial which has been forwarded to me against the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford—not on the ground of

* The Protest referred to will be found at p. 143.

any general unfitness for the office, or on any specific charge of heterodoxy, but because the 'University of Oxford has affirmed by a solemn decree its want of confidence in the soundness of his doctrines'—I feel I cannot conscientiously sign it, for the following reasons:—

1. Because I conceive that by such proceeding we are giving to a University censure an authority which in no way belongs to it, and which many of its most devoted friends have disclaimed. And further, that I can attach little weight to a decision emanating from Oxford on that occasion, bearing in mind that the movement against Dr. Hampden originated with a party suspected (how justly, subsequent events fully proved) of entertaining a strong leaning towards the Church of Rome; that the opinions, moreover, of many of those members of Convocation who opposed Dr. Hampden were manifested with a bitterness of party spirit little creditable to them as members of a Christian community and a calm deliberative assembly; and that there is good reason for believing that the majority was obtained by votes given by many individuals who came up expressly for the purpose, though it was notorious that they had never read the works which they professed to condemn.

2. That even if the censure of 1836 were deserving attention, it was virtually repealed by a statute in the early part of 1842, which expressly appointed Dr. Hampden to the office of Examiner in the new Theological Examination, and which was, by several influential members of the University, understood to cancel the previous censure; and that in the summer of 1842 an attempt was actually made to repeal the censure of 1836, which very nearly succeeded, supported as it was by some of the most distinguished members of the University—amongst others, I believe, by no less than fifteen out of seventeen of the Heads of colleges—and that it was opposed by a large portion of those well known for their Tractarian tendencies.

3. Because I believe Dr. Hampden to have been very unfairly treated, judged as he was by extracts separated from their context, and many of them obscurely worded, on points involving deep metaphysical reasoning, requiring unprejudiced and dispassionate investigations to decide upon.

4. Because I consider that on other occasions, more especially in his Inaugural Lecture, he has shown clearly and unequivocally, and beyond all controversy, that his sentiments on those particular topics on which he was supposed to be unsound were in accordance with the formularies of our Church and with the Holy Scriptures.

Such are the reasons for inducing me to withhold my signature to the memorial proposed to be presented by my right reverend brethren, expressive of their disapprobation of Dr. Hampden's appointment to the vacant See of Hereford.

I have only to add—though, indeed, I consider it scarcely necessary—that did I suspect Dr. Hampden in the slightest degree of holding opinions impugning the doctrines of the Trinity or the Atonement, I should not have hesitated a single moment in requesting that my name might be affixed to the memorial, with my fullest concurrence and approbation of its object.

I remain, yours very truly,

E. NORWICH.

To the Lord Bishop of ——.

PUBLISHED WORKS *of* BISHOP HAMPDEN.

An Essay on the Philosophical Evidence of Christianity. London: John Murray, 1827.

Parochial Sermons, Illustrative of the Importance of the Revelation of God in Jesus Christ. Second edition (including Four Sermons Preached to the Children of the Bath National School). London: B. Fellowes, 1836.

'Bampton Lectures' for 1832. The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its relation to Christian Theology. Third edition. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1848.

Observations on Religious Dissent. Second edition. London: B. Fellowes, 1834.

Inaugural Lecture as Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford. Fourth edition. Oxford: 1836.

A Lecture on Tradition, read before the University of Oxford on Thursday, March 7, 1839. Fifth edition, corrected and enlarged. London: B. Fellowes, 1842.

Lecture on the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. London: B. Fellowes, 1842.

'Thomas Aquinas,' an Article in the Encyclopædia Metropolitana.

A Course of Lectures Introductory to the Study of Moral Philosophy. Second edition. London: T. Fellowes, 1856.

Sermons preached before the University of Oxford in Christ Church Cathedral, 1836 to 1847. London: B. Fellowes, 1848.

'The House of God,' a Sermon preached at the re-Opening of Hereford Cathedral.

The Fathers of Greek Philosophy. Edinburgh: A. & C. Black, 1862.

Charge delivered at the Primary Visitation of the Diocese, August 1850. Second edition. London: B. Fellowes, 1850.

Charge delivered at the Second Visitation, in May and June 1853. London: B. Fellowes, 1854.

Charge delivered at the Third Visitation, in August 1856. London: T. Fellowes, 1856.

Charge delivered at the Fourth Visitation, in August 1859. Hereford: Joseph Head, 1859.

INDEX.

ARN

ARNOLD, Dr.: letter to Dr. Hampden on 'tests' at Oxford (1835), 37; — on agitation in 1836, 63; his view of the treatment of Dr. Hampden, 80; and of Dr. Hampden's position, 90; his account of the Inaugural Lecture in *Edinburgh Review*, 60

BAMPTON Lecturer, appointment as, 22
Bampton Lectures: the subject stated, 24–26; letter from the Bishop of Kildare to Archbishop Whately, 26; authorship falsely imputed to Mr. Blanco White, 27; Archdeacon Hare's *Letter to the Dean of Chichester*, 28; Introduction to second edition, 84; third edition published (1848), 168
Baptism, case of late, 173
Baptismal service, special interest in, 207
Bath, early visits to, 7; sketch of Dr. Hampden by lady at, 8
Biddulph, Miss, letter to, 173
Bishopric, proposed offer of (1835), 45

CANTERBURY, Archbishop of (Howley): letter to, from Dr. Hampden (1836), 55; remarks in House of Lords (1837), 95; Dr. Hampden's letter in reply, 96
Chalgrove Field, commemoration of anniversary of, 133
Charges and addresses, extracts from: Education of the Poor, 184; Ceremonial Observances, 188; The *Gorham Case*, 190; Sure Prospects of the Church, 194; Liberty of Thought in Church of England, 195; Convocation and Synods, 197, 198; Mythical Interpretation of the Facts of the Gospel, 210; Importance of Confirmation, 235; *Colenso on the Pentateuch*, 230
Child, letter written to a, 208
Church architecture and construction, views as to, 207
Church services, views respecting, 187; St. Barnabas, Pimlico, 188

DIV

Church and State agitation, feeling with respect to, 229
Clark, Archdeacon, recollections by, 249
Clergy of his diocese, influence upon, 192, 204, 205, 258; letter to the Rev. H. T. Hill, 206
Clough, Arthur Hugh, and the 'Tract Movement,' 89
Colenso on the Pentateuch: letter to Clergy, 230
Convocation, revival of, views as to, 198
Confirmation, views respecting, 170, 235; — sermon, extract from, 171; case of candidates from St. Martin's Home, 236
Confirmations, tour of, in 1848, 170, 253
Copleston, Bishop: letter to Dr. Hampden on *Philosophical Evidence of Christianity*, 18; — on agitation in 1836, 55; letters to, from Dr. Hampden, 163
Cox, the Rev. W. Hayward: letters to, from Dr. Hampden, 130, 131, 175, 176, 190
Cramer, Dean, letter from, to Dr. Hampden as to proceedings in Convocation in 1836, 141
Curacies, 15

DAVISON, the Rev. J.: letter to Dr. Hampden on leaving University, 15; — on *Philosophical Evidence of Christianity*, 18; — to the Rev. M. Rowlandson (1811), 5
Dawes, Dean: efforts with respect to Hereford Cathedral, 189
Deaths of infant children, 22; death of eldest daughter, 189
Denman, Lord Chief Justice, Judgment of, in Queen's Bench, 168
Diocesan duties, spirit in which undertaken, 228
Dissenters, justification of attitude towards, 230
Divinity, Regius Professor of, appointment as: offer from Lord Melbourne, 49; subsequent letters from him, 56; opposition to the appointment, 49–

59; remarks by Archbishop Whately 51, 52; letters from Dr. Hampden to Archbishop Whately, 53, 57, 70; —to Archbishop of Canterbury, 55; letter to Dr. Hampden from Bishop Copleston, 56; his attitude and conduct described, 71, 75, 83; *Inaugural Lecture*, extracts from, 60, 72; the lecture described by Dr. Arnold, in *Edinburgh Review*, 60; letter from Dr. Arnold, 63; his feeling in the matter, 80; his view of Dr. Hampden's position, 90; 'Select Preachers' statute, 64; legal 'Opinion' thereon, 65; the statute passed, 77; letter from the Rev. John Miller to Dr. Hampden, 76; Mr. W.W.Hull's pamphlet, 77, 79; *Dublin Review* (Roman Catholic) on the opposition to Dr. Hampden, 83; work as Divinity Professor, 86; letters to Mr. W. W. Hull and Archbishop Whately, 87, 88; discussion in House of Lords, 93; Mr. Nassau Senior's account of proceedings in Convocation, 66; Dean Cramer's letter, 141; letter from the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone to Dr. Hampden (1856), 199; letter from the Duke of Sussex, 81; conversation with an Unitarian, 81; Mr. Lancaster's publications, 85; correspondence with Duke of Wellington, 261

EDINBURGH REVIEW: article by Dr. Arnold on 'The Oxford Malignants and Dr. Hampden,' 60; letter from Dr. Hampden to the editor, 64

Education, question of: early efforts in diocese of Hereford, 178; speech at diocesan meeting, 181; extract from Primary Charge, 184; opinion of secular instruction, 186

Encyclopædia Britannica, contributions to (1831), 21; republished in one volume (1862), 224

Encyclopædia Metropolitana, contribution to, 22

Erle, Mr. Justice, judgment of, in Queen's Bench, 157

Essay on Philosophical Evidence of Christianity: extract from preface, 16; letters from Bishop Copleston and Mr. Davison, 18; extract from, 245

Essays and Reviews, referred to in Charge (1862), 212

Ewelme Church, 127

Ewelme, life and work at, 124-7; influence upon Dissenters, 125; letters from Ewelme—to eldest son, 129; to the Rev. W. Hayward Cox, 130; farewell address from parishioners (1847), 134; Dr. Hampden's reply, 136

Exeter, Bishop of (Phillpotts): dispenses with Regius Professor's testimonial, 74; letter from Dr. Hampden on the subject, 74

GLADSTONE, the Right Hon. W. E., letter from (1856), 199

Gorham Case, observations on the, 190

HAMPDEN, Mrs., death of (1865), 233; letter from Dr. Hampden to Mrs. King, 233

Hampden, Mr. John, 3; inscription on his tomb by Dr. Hampden, 3

Hampden, Miss Mary, letter from (1802), 2

Hare, Archdeacon: *Letter to the Dean of Chichester*, extracts from, 28, 139, 140

Hereford, Bishop of, appointment as (1847), 138; outbreak of opposition, 138; Archdeacon Hare's *Letter to the Dean of Chichester*, 139; letter to Dr. Hampden from Dean Cramer, 141; protest by thirteen Bishops, 143; Lord John Russell's reply, 144; Bishop of Norwich's reasons for not joining in the protest, 277; letter from Dr. Hampden to Lord John Russell, 263; anticipated legal proceedings, 145; correspondence with the Bishop of Oxford, 145; letter from the Provost of Oriel to the Bishop of Oxford, 149; letter from Lord John Russell to the Dean of Hereford, 273; election by Chapter of Hereford, 154; dissentients, 154; 'confirmation' of the election described by Archdeacon Clark, 251; opposition to the 'confirmation,' 155; judgments of Vicar-General and Dr. Lushington, 155; application to Court of Queen's Bench, 156; application refused, 157; addresses of sympathy and congratulation, 151; letter from Duke of Sutherland, 30; Lord John Russell's reply to address from Bedford clergy, 273; consecration, 164; entry on episcopal work, 166, 172

Hereford Cathedral, reopening of, after restoration, 187; efforts of Dean Dawes, 189

HIL

Hill, the Rev. H. T., letter to, 206
Hinds, Bishop, sketch of Dr. Hampden by, 9; sermon at the consecration of Dr. Hampden, 164
Holland, the Rev. Mr., of Stoke Bliss, 206
Hull, Mr. W. W., pamphlet by, 77; letter to, from Dr. Hampden, on agitation in 1836, 78;—on entering upon work as Regius Professor, 87;—upon University reform, 112, 113;—upon Mr. Ward's case, 117, 118;—on the opposition to his appointment to Hereford, 161, 162

INAUGURAL LECTURE as Regius Professor: extracts from, 60, 72; described by Dr. Arnold, in *Edinburgh Review*, 60
Ingham, Robert, Esq., Q.C., sketch of Dr. Hampden by, 11
Isle of Wight, visits to, 6, 30, 191

JEWISH Disabilities Bill, votes for (1848), 167
Jews, missions to, views respecting, 167

KILDARE, Bishop of: letter to Archbishop Whately, 26
King, Mrs. Robert, letters to, 208, 233

LANCASTER, Mr., publications of, 85
Lecture on Thirty-nine Articles, extracts from, 115, 230
Lecture on Tradition, extract from, 50
Letter to a son at school, 129
'Letters Dimissory,' opinion as to, 174
Lewis, Sir G. C.: letter to Dr. Hampden from, 224; memorial to him at Hereford, 226; Lord Palmerston at the unveiling, 226
'Literates,' practice with regard to, 174
Lords, House of: discussion on Dr. Hampden's appointment as Regius Professor, 93

MACMULLEN, Mr., question raised by, 116
Marriage (1817), 15
'Maynooth Grant,' the, letters respecting, 118, 119
Melbourne, Lord, letters from, 49, 57; defends Dr. Hampden's writings in House of Lords (1837), 95

PAR

Miller, the Rev. John, letter from, 76
Moral Philosophy, Professor of, appointment as (1834), 41
Moral Philosophy Lectures: the subject stated, 41; difficulties of the study, 42; its value and rewards, 43–45
'Mythical Theory' of the Gospels, Charge relating to, 210

NAPIER, Mr. Macvey: letter to Dr. Hampden from, 21; letter to, from Dr. Hampden, 64
Nemesis of Faith, opinion of, 177
Newman, Dr. J. H., pamphlet of, re-published in 1847, 138
Norwich, Bishop of (Stanley): reasons for not joining in protest of Bishops, 277

OBSERVATIONS on Religious Dissent, extracts from, 35, 37; letter from Dr. Arnold, 37; letter from Dr. Hampden to Archbishop Whately, 39
Ordained deacon (1816),—priest (1817), 15
Ordinations: rules of conduct with respect to candidates, 167, 173, 255; first ordination at Hereford, 167; last ordination (1867), 238
Oriel, Provost of, letter from, to Bishop of Oxford (1848), 149
Oxford, Bishop of (Wilberforce), correspondence with (1847), 145
Oxford, University of: early life at Oriel, 4–6; honours at B.A. degree (1813), 6; Prize for Latin Essay, 6; Fellow of Oriel (1814), 7; and Tutor, 23; returns to Oxford (1829), 21; Examiner for B.A. degree (1829, 1831, 1832), 21; Bampton Lecturer (1832), 22; Principal of St. Mary Hall (1833), 30; Professor of Moral Philosophy (1834), 41; Regius Professor of Divinity (1836), 49; Head of Board of Examiners in Theology, 114
Oxford, University of: changes effected by Cathedrals Bill, 113; reform desired by Dr. Hampden, 112; views as to representation of, 119

PALMERSTON, Lord: visit to Hereford (1863), 226
'Papal Aggression' of 1850, remarks upon, 191
Paris, letter written from (1863), 222

PAR

Parochial Sermons: extract from preface, 19; second edition published, 19; incident connected with, 21; extract from sermon, 228
Patronage, exercise of, 203; letter to a clergyman on preferment, 203; letter to Mr. Evans, 204
Personal characteristics: in childhood, 2; at Oxford, 9; in general society, 8–14, 223; as a preacher, 203; as a speaker, 184; as a tutor, 249; general reading, 224; delight in natural scenery, 225; last illness and closing days, 237–242; general recollections, 243
Peterborough, Bishop of (Jeune): friendly assistance in Dr. Hampden's illness, 238
Prince Consort, sermon on occasion of death of, 201

QUEEN'S Bench, application to, on Dr. Hampden's appointment to Hereford, 156

'ROCK OF AGES,' Greek translation of, 240
Rowlandson, the Rev. E., letter by, 68
Rowlandson, the Rev. M.: influence during Dr. Hampden's boyhood, 4; letter from, to Mr. Renn Hampden, 6
Russell, Lord John: Bishopric of Hereford offered by (1847), 138; letter from Dr. Hampden to (1847), 263; letter to Dean of Hereford, 273; letter in reply to address of Bedford clergy, 273

ST. MARY HALL: appointment as Principal of (1833), 30; recollections by the Rev. W. Sinclair, 31; Dr. Hampden's work at, 34; correspondence with Duke of Wellington, 91
Scudamore Charity at Hereford, 178
'Select Preachers' statute, 64; the statute rejected, 66; — passed, 77; legal 'Opinion' thereon, 65; account by Mr. Nassau Senior of proceedings in Convocation, 66; letter to Archbishop Whately, 69; letter by the Rev. E. Rowlandson, 68; proposal for repeal rejected, 114
Senior, Mr. Nassau: letter to, 47; his account of proceedings in Convocation (1836), 66

WOR

Sinclair, the Rev. W., recollections by, 31
Strangers officiating in diocese, rule as to, 176
Suffolk, Duchess of, monument to, in Ewelme Church, 127
Sussex, Duke of, letter from (1837), 81
Sutherland, Duke of, letter from (1847), 30

'TESTS' at Oxford, question of, in 1834, 35; Dr. Hampden's *Observations on Religious Dissent*, 35; letter from Dr. Arnold, 37; letter to Mr. Nassau Senior, 47; views of an Unitarian, 81
'Tract Movement,' the, views as to, 32, 89, 120; letter to Archbishop Whately, 90

UNITARIAN, Conversation with an, 81
University Reform: letters to Mr. W. W. Hull, 112; changes at Oxford in 1842, 113; appointment of a Royal Commission, 190
University Sermons, extracts from, 120–123

WARD, Mr., case of (*Ideal of the Christian Church*): letters to Mr. W. W. Hull, 117
Waring, Archdeacon, remarks by, 205
Wellington, the Duke of: correspondence with Dr. Hampden on proceedings of 1836, 261;—relating to St. Mary Hall (1837), 91; remark in the House of Lords (1837), 94
Whately, Archbishop, on the opposition to Dr. Hampden in 1836, 51; his account of the proceedings, 52
Whately, Archbishop, letter to, from Dr. Hampden, after publication of *Observations on Religious Dissent*, 39; — on opposition to him in 1836, 53, 57, 70; — on entry upon work as Regius Professor, 88; — as to 'Tract' party, 90
White, Mr. Blanco, at Oxford: personal characteristics, 23; authorship of *Bampton Lectures* falsely imputed to him, 27; Archdeacon Hare's letter on the subject, 28
Worcester, Bishop of: friendly assistance rendered in Bishop Hampden's illness, 238

Spottiswoode & Co., Printers, New-street Square, London.

00020592

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018